

COLGATE ROCHESTER DIVINITY SCHOOL  
AMBROSE SWASEY LIBRARY  
1100 SOUTH GOODMAN STREET  
ROCHESTER 7, NEW YORK

# Concordia Theological Monthly



J U N E



1 9 5 7

# Concordia Theological Monthly

*Published by The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod*

EDITED BY THE FACULTY OF CONCORDIA SEMINARY  
ST. LOUIS, MO

*Address all communications to the Editorial Committee in care of  
the Managing Editor, Walter R. Roehrs, 801 De Mun Ave.,  
St. Louis 5, Mo.*

## EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

VICTOR BARTLING, PAUL M. BRETSCHER,  
RICHARD R. CAEMMERER, ALFRED O. FUERBRINGER,  
ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN, WALTER R. ROEHRs,  
LEWIS W. SPITZ, LORENZ WUNDERLICH

## CONTENTS

FOR JUNE 1957	PAGE
WILLIAM FREDERICK ARNDT, 1880—1957. <i>Paul M. Bretscher</i>	401
LWF STUDY DOCUMENT. <i>Paul M. Bretscher</i>	409
CONTRITION. <i>Theodore Engelder</i>	417
Translated by <i>H. J. A. Bouman</i> and <i>Erwin Lueker</i>	
WAS LUTHER A NOMINALIST? <i>Bengt Haegglund</i>	441
HOMILETICS	453
THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER	461
BOOK REVIEW	469

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY is published monthly by Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis 18, Mo., to which all business correspondence is to be addressed.

\$3.00 per annum, anywhere in the world, payable in advance.

Entered at the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo., as second-class matter. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 5, 1918.

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

e of  
ive,

AGE

01

09

17

41

53

61

69

ing  
nce

for  
17,  
A.





# Concordia Theological Monthly

VOL. XXVIII

JUNE 1957

No. 6

## William Frederick Arndt

1880 — 1957

By PAUL M. BRETSCHER

**I**N a letter dated March 5, 1957, and addressed to Dr. Arndt's two surviving daughters, Rev. E. George Pearce of London, England, provided the following information regarding Dr. Arndt's last hours on earth:

Apparently Dr. Arndt took the 2:05 train [in the afternoon] from Kings Cross in London, arriving at Cambridge at about 3:30. This train stops [terminates its run] at Cambridge. The collector boarded the train to see whether all the passengers had removed and whether anything had been left on the train. He found the train empty except for the compartment in which your father was sitting. Noticing that he didn't look well, he asked Dr. Arndt how he was. "I'm not feeling very well," Dr. Arndt replied in quite a normal voice. The collector said, "All right, just stay there until you feel better. I'll be back in a few minutes."

When he returned, Dr. Arndt said, "I feel all right now, I'll go," reaching for his briefcase. "No, I'll take it for you," said the collector, and taking him by the arm helped him out of the train. They had gone only a few yards when your father slumped and collapsed but was held up by the collector. A stretcher was brought, an ambulance called, and in less than five minutes your



*William Frederick Arndt*

father was at the Addenbroke Hospital, Cambridge. The collector thought that your father passed on about 3:40, but it was not until around 4 o'clock that the doctors at the hospital confirmed his death.

Your father lived by the faith of Jesus Christ. . . . We mourn his passing, because a great void has been left in your hearts and ours. But we know that Monday, February 25, was a day of victory, another triumph over death, another sinner clutched from sin and cleansed in Jesus' blood, another saint saved by God's grace and mercy.

Obituaries of, and tributes to, Dr. Arndt have appeared in the *Lutheraner* (March 19) and the *Lutheran Witness* (March 26). In this tribute we are recording, therefore, only the most basic facts of Dr. Arndt's earthly life.

William Frederick Arndt was born at Mayville, Wis., on December 1, 1880. He studied for the holy ministry at Concordia College, St. Paul (1894—1897), Concordia College, Milwaukee (1897 to 1900), and Concordia Seminary (1900—1903). He earned his M. A. degree at the University of Chicago in 1923 and his Ph. D. degree at Washington University, St. Louis, in 1935. In 1930 Concordia College in Adelaide, South Australia, conferred on him the honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity.

From 1902 to 1912 Dr. Arndt served parishes in Tennessee, Missouri, and New York. In 1912 he began his long and distinguished career as educator. From 1912 to 1921 he served as professor of ancient languages at St. Paul's College, Concordia, Mo., and since 1921 as professor of New Testament exegesis and literature at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis. For a number of years he gave courses also in the Summer School of Concordia Teachers College, River Forest, Ill. In May 1956 he left for England to help lay the foundation of a program of ministerial training for the Evangelical Lutheran Church of England. A memorial service was held for him March 3 at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, in which Dr. R. R. Caemmerer, his former student, former pastor, colleague, and friend, preached the sermon. Dr. Arndt's body was laid to rest March 7 at New Bethlehem Cemetery, St. Louis, next to that of his beloved wife Emma, née Vetter, who died in 1933. Rev. Henry E. Dederer, Dr. Arndt's pastor, officiated at the grave.

The autopsy revealed that the immediate cause of Dr. Arndt's death was coronary thrombosis. A secondary cause was coronary atheroma.

Besides teaching at the seminary in St. Louis for thirty-five years, Dr. Arndt served the church in many other ways. He was secretary of the Western District from 1912 to 1921. For thirty-five years he was a member of the Board for Foreign Missions and for twenty-one years a member of the Committee for Lutheran Union. He frequently occupied pulpits, and he delivered many essays at conferences and synodical conventions. He was a founder of Mount Olive Lutheran Church in St. Louis in 1925 and its assistant pastor thereafter. He also lent a helping hand in the establishment of Luther Memorial Church in Richmond Heights, Mo.

Dr. Arndt was an effective writer. He contributed to the literature of our church a number of books and a vast number of articles. His name is linked with the CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY since its birth in 1930. From 1930 to 1938 he was one of its co-editors and from 1938 to 1949 its managing editor. From 1924 to 1926 he edited *Magazin für ev.-luth. Homiletik und Pastoraltheologie*, and from 1926 to 1930 the THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY. In the twenties he wrote also for *Lehre und Wehre*.

Dr. Arndt was every inch a scholar. His interest in the language, literature, history, and text of the New Testament kept him in close contact with leading scholars in our own country, Germany, Sweden, England, and elsewhere. He remained abreast of current New Testament scholarship by reading the most recent literature on the subject. Through persistent and patient effort he acquired a facile reading knowledge of Swedish, French, and Italian. Though Greek always remained his favorite language, he never lost his competence in the Semitic languages. A member for many years of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, the American Philological Association, and the St. Louis Society of the Archaeological Institute of America, he attended their meetings as regularly as his busy schedule permitted. He was an ardent promoter of the American School for Oriental Research. He was also a member of the Classics Club of St. Louis, where he read scholarly essays and which he also served as president. His trip to the Near East in 1947 enabled him personally to explore the sites hallowed by

the pages of Holy Scripture and led him to publish his sprightly and fascinating volume *From the Nile to the Waters of Damascus*.

Throughout his life Dr. Arndt retained the highest regard for the founder of our church, Dr. C. F. W. Walther. He was one of the last members of his generation who knew and assimilated Walther's theological views as Walther had expressed them in many articles of the *Lutheraner* and *Lehre und Wehre*. This interest in Walther led Dr. Arndt to become thoroughly acquainted also with other articles in *Lehre und Wehre*, some of which, because of his direction, appeared in English dress in this journal. Dr. Arndt could cite, without much effort, the number of the volume and the year in which important articles in *Lehre und Wehre* had appeared.

This link with the early theology of our church had an abiding influence on Dr. Arndt as a theologian. He was throughout his life a stout defender of the doctrine of the divine inspiration and inerrancy of Holy Scripture. In the preface to his recent commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke he writes:

The book . . . adheres to the position that the Bible is the Word of God and the only infallible guide for our faith and life and that Luke's Gospel, being a part of the Holy Scriptures, has been given through divine inspiration and must be treated as having that kind of origin. . . . There can be no doubt that it [this attitude] represents Christ's own position toward the Old Testament, and the author has the conviction that it is the attitude which our divine Teacher directs us to hold toward the writings of the New Testament also (p. ix).

But of all divine truths of Scripture, Paul's teaching of justification by faith always lay nearest to Dr. Arndt's heart. On this teaching he could speak and write with a special measure of joyous conviction because he sincerely believed it to be the heart and core of the Christian Gospel. And woe to him who dared to distort this most comforting doctrine! Every interpretation which in Dr. Arndt's opinion veered away in the slightest degree from what he believed is the true interpretation of Paul's teaching on justification was for him anathema. His studies of the Confessions, which had been largely stimulated by the theology of our early fathers, convinced him also that our Confessions are a true exposition of the doctrine of Holy Scripture.

Dr. Arndt shared with Walther a profound humility. This kept him from becoming a dogmatist in matters regarding which Scripture has not spoken clearly. He was critical of clichés and theological formulations which, over the years, so he believed, had become so worn that their original meaning had become obscure. For this reason he was always ready to discuss Scriptural truth also with those who were accustomed to formulations other than those current in our own theological language. This factor also, coupled with his personal piety and unfeigned love, kept him from rashly condemning those who disagreed with him in matters of no immediate bearing on the Christian faith. Dr. Arndt was a man who, though powerfully convicted of the truth of Scripture and the Confessions, had also learned the importance of respecting evangelical freedom. He contended that there will always be cases of casuistry which cannot be adjudicated by rules and regulations that violate the Christian principle of love.

His studies in Scripture helped him to grow in Biblical understanding. In instances he moved beyond formerly held positions and frankly acknowledged his change of opinion. But though his passion for truth compelled him henceforth to speak and write in terms of his new convictions, he remembered at the same time that Christians must be careful not to offend the brethren and that they must be willing to go to the utmost limits in their endeavor to be considerate, understanding, loving, and forgiving. It has been said that Dr. Arndt was kind and irenic. But he was that in the manner of Paul, who said of himself: "As servants of God we commend ourselves in every way . . . by purity, knowledge, forbearance, kindness, the Holy Spirit, genuine love, truthful speech, and the power of God . . . in honor and dishonor, in ill repute and good repute." (2 Cor. 6:4ff.)

Like Luther, Dr. Arndt cultivated a genuine interest in all things that are lovely and true. He knew that the God who redeemed the world is the same God who created it and that He created it for man and not man for the world. Dr. Arndt loved God's great outdoors. He had a naturalist's eye for the countryside, for flowers, forests, hills, brooks, and rivers. He could withdraw with his daughters over weekends in spring and fall and thoroughly enjoy the beauty and bounty of God's creative hand. At the same time

he had a high regard for the creative imagination of man. He loved the fine arts, in particular music (Brahms) and literature. Among his favorite men of letters were Homer, Plato, Thackeray, Macaulay, Scott, Schiller, Pascal, and Mark Twain, and he could quote freely from their writings. This knowledge often stood him in good stead in addresses and social gatherings. In addition, he accumulated over the years an almost inexhaustible store of poetic tidbits, humorous anecdotes, and harmless banter which colored and spiced his language. He was a raconteur of rare ability. Like the householder in the parable, he brought forth "out of his treasure things new and old" (Matt. 13:52). He had also a remarkably accurate memory. When telling of an experience the second or third time, and perhaps years later, the account varied only in non-essential details. He had a passion for truth, honesty, and integrity. There was a flash of fire in his eyes when anyone attempted to deal with him deceitfully and dishonestly.

Dr. Arndt had many friends. He had the rare ability to enter sympathetically into the concerns of children, adolescents, students, pastors, lay members of the church, and of scholars who represented various areas of scholarship. Always respected for his views by exegetes and linguists, Dr. Arndt could carry on fruitful conversations with lawyers, medical men, and learned individuals of other professions. And yet his love for the Savior and His precious Gospel was always uppermost in his thought. This love often asserted itself when the topic under consideration was a very mundane one indeed.

Dr. Arndt's closest earthly friend was his Greek New Testament, which he always had with him. At hotels where he spent many nights as essayist or guest of a conference or convention, he would, upon arising in the morning, get his Nestle, sit down on the bedside and read and contemplate a passage. But he read not only the construction, he examined not only the variants, but he also took a deep draught from the living water of eternal truth which the Holy Spirit has poured into the imperishable writings of Holy Scripture.

The Lord had endowed Dr. Arndt not only with a sound mind but also with a sound body. For this gift he oftentimes expressed his special thanks. Years ago he occasionally took off a few hours

for a round of golf. Professionals would have observed that his stance and swing were thoroughly unorthodox. But they would have admitted that he usually drove right down the middle. In late years he seemed to find most relaxation in the company of friends whom he invited to his hospitable home. He lost no time in purposeless motion. Even in England he preached quite regularly and read essays to the pastors' conference and before groups of students at Cambridge. "I cannot recall a single moment when I was troubled with feelings of ennui," he once remarked to Rev. Pearce. He could say this because he was always mindful of the Savior's sense of obligation expressed by Him in John 9:4: "We must work the works of Him who sent Me, while it is day; night comes, when no one can work."

In 1951, when Dr. Arndt was retired as a regular member of the faculty and placed on modified service, his colleagues honored him in a set of resolutions of appreciation, from which we quote the following:

WHEREAS, as a scholar, a theologian, and a teacher, he has been of singular benefit to the entire church in the training of her ministry; and

WHEREAS, in the interest of the church and in keeping with the precepts and teachings of the Word of God, he has helped to advance the cause of ecumenicity and of God-pleasing church union successfully and with due foresight, courage, patience, and discretion; and

WHEREAS, in his labors as a colleague he has been consistently kind, considerate, understanding, and helpful, always bearing in mind his obligations as a servant of Jesus Christ and of the church; therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the faculty, at this time of his retirement from our midst, express its appreciation for the valuable service he has rendered to Concordia Seminary and to the church at large; and be it furthermore

*Resolved*, That the faculty assure him of its prayers for continued health, strength, joy, and blessing.

In further token of its high esteem for Dr. Arndt, the editorial committee dedicated the December 1951 issue of this journal to him as a *Festschrift*.

The Lord of the Church crowned the labors of His faithful witness with abundant success. Late in 1956 Dr. Arndt had the joy of holding in his hands a copy of his valuable commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke, which had only recently been published. In January of this year he had the further joy of holding in his hands one of the first copies of the monumental Arndt-Gingrich *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, to which he and his associate Dr. F. Wilbur Gingrich had devoted all of eight years of intensive scholarly effort. For decades to come this lexicon will be the most widely used Greek-English dictionary of the New Testament.

But what are all tributes paid by sinful mortal men to a sinful fellow mortal? The Lord of the Church has now paid His devoted servant the final and greatest tribute. He has released him from this mortal body and given him the inheritance which is imperishable, undefiled, and unfading. Dr. Arndt often said when he had completed a labor of love or when friends complimented him, "God be praised!" We are certain that he said, "God be praised!" also in that moment when God called him to the heavenly reward. Ἀναστήσω αὐτὸν ἐσχάτῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ.

St. Louis, Mo.



# LWF Study Document

By PAUL M. BRETSCHER

## *CHRIST FREES AND UNITES*

Study Document for the Third Assembly of the Lutheran World Federation, Minneapolis, Minn., U.S.A., August 15—25, 1957. Edited by the Department of Theology of the Lutheran World Federation. Geneva, Switzerland, 1956. 36 pages.

The present Study Document, which will be submitted to the delegates attending the Assembly of the LWF at Minneapolis next August, is in form and content a decided improvement over the document which appeared a year ago. A careful comparison of both compels the conclusion that the Commission on Theology was truly concerned to prepare a statement which would be solidly Scriptural and soundly confessional. For these efforts the Commission deserves the unqualified thanks of all who love the Lutheran Zion. The following observations are therefore intended only to point up some issues in the present document which, in our opinion, deserve further clarification "in order that in everything God may be glorified through Jesus Christ."

This study document consists of an introduction and five parts: the freedom we have in Christ; the unity of the church in Christ; the freedom to reform the church; free for service in the world; free and united in hope. The five parts are, however, not so many loose and independent units of thought, but rather constitute a single closely reasoned argument, which culminates in Section II.

This is not to say, however, that Part I is a mere introduction and that Parts III—V are of no particular consequence. The fact of the matter is that Part I, which prepares the way for Part II, is from our point of view both new and novel and therefore deserving of thoughtful analysis. Parts III—V, though of great importance, do not raise serious questions. This review therefore limits itself to Parts I and II.

Before recording some concerns, we shall indicate what appear to be the significant steps in the argument. They are: Christ set men free through His redemptive act. He set men free not "for autonomous individuality" (II, A, 24) but for unity. This unity in Christ is a gift. Nevertheless, Christians should manifest this unity. This unity becomes manifest in church fellowship. But church fellowship requires agreement regarding the Gospel and the right administration of the Sacraments. When such agreement has been reached, altar and pulpit fellowship necessarily follow. Church fellowship must

assert itself also in participation in ecumenical endeavors. The church is free for service in the world. The church is free and united in hope.

In developing its argument the document is intent on supporting its statements with evidence from Scripture and the Confessions. According to our count, about 40 passages from Scripture are cited in full, some 190 are referred to in footnotes, and over 30 are suggested for "further study." The text itself contains citations from Scripture together with references. The Lutheran Symbols are frequently referred to as well as some of Luther's writings other than those received into the *Book of Concord*.

We shall state our concerns in terms of three questions. In a final paragraph we shall call attention to what we believe are inadequate or unfortunate formulations. Our questions are these:

1. Are the definitions of "Gospel" truly expressive of the Lutheran accent?
2. Does the correlation of "freedom" with "unity" truly conform to New Testament theology?
3. Is the analysis of "unity" clear and in full harmony with the New Testament concept of "unity"?

## I

The study document defines the Gospel as follows: "The message of the Gospel can be summarized under the caption: The Freedom of the Christian" (Introduction, p. 6). "The Church's task is to proclaim to the world the glad news that God's act in Christ truly sets men free" (I, A, 13). "The Gospel is the good news that Jesus Christ has come to set man free" (I, C, 17). "It is the Gospel which brings to us the proclamation that the liberating act of Christ is our own freedom, to be appropriated by us in faith" (I, D, 19).

We ask: Are these definitions of "Gospel" truly expressive of the Lutheran accent? The document indeed says that Christ suffered for our sins and bore in our place the wrath of God, that God in Christ reconciled us to Himself, that by virtue of Christ's righteousness we are made righteous before God, and that as a result of reconciliation we receive by grace the forgiveness of sins (I, C, 17, 18). But do not these statements merely serve the purpose of providing the basis for the document's accent on freedom? The *cantus firmus* to be heard throughout the document, practically on every page, if not in almost every paragraph, is that Christ has made us free and frees us.

But is this freedom achieved by Christ the keynote of the Gospel? Does not Article IV of the Augsburg Confession place the vicarious

atonement into the center of Christ's redemptive act? Does it not read: "They teach that men cannot be justified before God by their own strength, merits, or works, but are freely justified for Christ's sake, through faith, when they believe that their sins are forgiven for Christ's sake, who, by His death, has made satisfaction for our sins"? Therefore, is not the Gospel of Jesus Christ, above every other consideration, Gospel because it tells us that Jesus Christ, the Son of God, made atonement for our sins through His obedience, suffering and death, that He appeased the Father's wrath, that He reconciled the world to His Father, and that, as a result, man no longer needs to fear God's wrath and eternal punishment? Most certainly, the Gospel includes the good news that by His atoning work Christ freed and redeemed man from the bondage of sin, the fear of death, the power of the devil, and enables him to serve God in righteousness and true holiness. But does not Scripture stress, above all, that Christ reconciled us to God by suffering and dying for our sins?

We cite only a few passages: "Christ Himself bore our sins in His body on the tree. . . . By His wounds you have been healed" (1 Peter 2:24). "Christ died for the ungodly. . . . God shows His love for us in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. . . . We were reconciled to God by the death of His Son" (Rom. 5:6 ff.). "God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself, not counting their trespasses against them" (2 Cor. 5:18, 19). "He [the Son of God] loved me and gave Himself for me" (Gal. 2:20); "Christ loved the church and gave Himself up for her" (Eph. 5:25). "Behold the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world" (John 1:29). "He [God] did not spare His own Son but gave Him up for us all" (Rom. 8:32). "Whom God put forward as an expiation by His blood" (Rom. 3:25).

Is not, so we inquire, the chief accent of the Gospel, as Lutherans have always interpreted it, the blessed truth that Christ gave Himself into death to atone for our sins, to suffer divine wrath, and to make us beloved children of God? Surely, we lay in the bonds of sin and death and the devil, from which Christ freed us. But is not this freedom the inevitable consequence of the fact that He first reconciled us to God?

We ask furthermore: Is it not strange that the document, when it speaks of Christ's redemptive work (p. 7), does not even refer to the important passage in Rom. 5:6-11? And does it not disturb one to note that in the body of the text (pp. 7-9), which discusses the "freedom we have in Christ," the argument of Romans 1-5 is not even

referred to? And does it not seem strange that those precious terms "justification," "righteousness," and "reconciliation" are all too quickly disposed of on page 9? Have Lutherans not always declared that the Gospel is, above all, that wonderful message which tells us that God, because Christ reconciled the world to Him, justifies the sinner, forgives him all his sins, and assures him of eternal salvation? Indeed, God's ultimate purpose was to set men free from every form of bondage. Yet the manner in which He carried out His purpose was to have His own Son die for the sins of the world. It is this aspect of the Gospel message that constitutes its heart and center.

## II

Does the correlation of "freedom" with "unity" really conform to New Testament theology? Let us look at the arguments in the study document. Part I analyzes the "freedom we have in Christ," and Part II discusses "the unity of the church in Christ." The connecting link is the preposition "for" ("Free for Unity," II, A). The term *freedom* is pressed into the service of the term *unity*. Now, it is true that Christ, by His redemptive act, freed man from the curse and slavery of sin, from the fear of death, and from the power of the devil. But what is the purpose of this freedom according to the New Testament? Is it not that we might be free from the Law (Gal. 4:21-31); that we might become "slaves of righteousness" (Rom. 6:18); "slaves of God" (Rom. 6:22); "obedient . . . to the standard of teaching to which you were committed" (Rom. 6:17)? This freedom imposes the obligation on Christians "to walk by the Spirit" (Gal. 5:25); "to be servants of one another" (Gal. 6:15); "to live as servants of God" (1 Peter 2:16); to avoid strife, dissension, envy, pride, and many other sins which threaten to enslave the Christian life. In brief, the freedom which Christ achieved for the Christian means that the Christian should regard himself a slave of God, of Christ, of his brethren, of his fellow men in general.

But now the question: What is the relation of this freedom to the "unity of the church in Christ"? The document declares: "Christ frees us by binding us to Himself, incorporating us into His body and bringing us under His salutary lordship and into His kingdom. By Christ's act of liberation we are reconciled and united to God" (II, A, 24). Is it New Testament teaching that *Christ frees us by binding us to Himself*? Should we not say that Christ frees us, in fact *has* freed us, from the bondage of the Law, sin, death, and the devil and that when we accept this freedom in faith, He incorporates

us into His body? Furthermore, does it not seem strange to say: "By Christ's act of liberation we are reconciled and united to God"? Is it not more in keeping with New Testament thought to say that because of Christ's act of reconciliation we are, in fact *were*, liberated from the powers of evil and that in the act of faith we are united into Christ's body, the church, where we serve Him in everlasting righteousness, innocence, and blessedness?

The footnote on page 13 suggests that the authors themselves had difficulty in establishing the relation of freedom to unity. The footnote reads: "The Assembly theme *Christ Frees and Unites* does not mean that unity is added to freedom in the work of Christ. Unity is rather a result of our freedom in Christ. The liberating act of God unites us to Christ and to one another." In view of this footnote, it would have been well if the Assembly theme had read "Christ frees and therefore unites," or "Because Christ frees, He also unites." But granting for a moment that the "and" in the Assembly theme is not to be stressed unduly, the question still remains: Is it theologically sound to establish a close connection between the freedom which Christ achieved and the unity of the church? To us it appears that freedom and unity can be correlated theologically only with difficulty.

Indeed, exegetes and dogmaticians have the privilege and the duty to extract from the sacred text, on the basis of defensible hermeneutical principles, inferences regarding the meaning of words and their bearing on the Christian faith. They also have the privilege to build such inferences into a construct of thought. This has always happened and will continue to happen. But should one engage in erecting a construct of theological thought, such as correlating freedom with unity, on the basis of such slender New Testament evidence as the study document supplies? Where is there in the entire New Testament a passage which co-ordinates the concepts of freedom and unity? We seem to have a great deal of trouble trying to make clear the full implications of the New Testament concept of unity. Why, we ask, inject another term into the discussion and increase the difficulty?

### III

Is the analysis of unity clear and in full accord with the New Testament concept of unity? The concept unity is dealt with in Part II ("The Unity of the Church in Christ"). To us it seemed that, in spite of the authors' evident determination to be clear and direct, the term *unity* is ambiguous. The authors use the terms "unity," "unity at any price," "genuine unity," "true unity," and "church unity." The trend of the argument is, as was noted above, to show that "church unity,"

that is, external fellowship between churches, must be sought after on the basis of a consensus with respect to the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments. But when this consensus has been achieved, then altar and pulpit fellowship necessarily follows, and participation in ecumenical endeavors is inescapable. Churches that are agreed with other churches in the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments, but nevertheless do not practice altar and pulpit fellowship with them, are responsible for the fact that "the plurality of churches becomes a serious problem" (p. 16, footnote 3).

One fails to discover in Part II a clear statement regarding the nature of the unity in Christ and how this unity was achieved by Him. Of this "oneness" (we prefer this term to "unity") the Savior speaks in the Gospel of John: "other sheep," "one flock" (John 10:16); "Jesus should die . . . not for the nation only, but to gather into one the children of God who are scattered abroad" (John 11:52); "I do not pray for these only, but also for those *who are to believe in Me through their Word*, that they may all be one" (John 17: 20, 21 — italics my own). This oneness obviously refers to the oneness of Jews and Gentiles which Jesus meant to bring about by reconciling the world unto God. This oneness He effected on the cross (Eph. 2:13-22). Because He achieved, through His blood, forgiveness for all men, Jews and Gentiles, the oneness of the church since Pentecost consists in this, that it is made up of Jews and Gentiles who recognize the same Lord, the same Baptism, and the same God and Father of all. They are united in one body and in one Spirit. This is the oneness of the church. This oneness was achieved by Christ; it is made available by the Spirit through the Gospel; it is accepted by faith; and it is consummated at the Lord's Table.

The church is the congregation of all true believers. They are found wherever the Gospel is preached and the Sacraments are administered according to Christ's institution. As members of the one body of Christ, they are brethren (1 Cor. 10:17). As members of the one body and as brethren in the same faith, they are to love one another, avoid strife and dissension, overcome pride and arrogance, carry one another's burdens. As members of the body of Christ in a given locality, they are to worship together and to promote the preaching of the Gospel. As members of Christ's body, they are to avoid false teachings and to observe all that Christ has commanded them. Already the New Testament makes it evident that Christian congregations cultivated Christian fellowship with one another (Antioch and Jerusalem, Acts 15). The New Testament also reports that the congre-

gations in Macedonia showed concern for the physical needs of their brethren in the church of Jerusalem. But it may be difficult to establish from the New Testament that "unity does require a visible expression of fellowship among churches" (II, E, 34). It would rather seem that churches which are agreed "concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments" (II, E, 36) will seek visible expression of their fellowship with one another as a result of the operations of the Spirit of God.

The document before us eloquently stresses the need of a consensus as defined by the Augsburg Confession in Article VII. But is it not of importance at this point to note that the authors of the Lutheran Symbols took an attitude toward Holy Scripture which in some quarters of Lutheranism no longer exists? The real problem in present-day Lutheranism is not, first of all, disagreement among Lutherans regarding the consensus requirement of Article VII of the Augsburg Confession, but divergent attitudes toward Holy Scripture. Indeed, Jesus Christ is "Savior, Reconciler, Redeemer and Liberator" (p. 5). But the New Testament also describes Him as the Prophet and Teacher come from God. And this Prophet and Teacher has some things to say about the Old Testament which are largely disregarded or made light of today. He also gave His apostles, who became the authors of the New Testament, the gift of His Spirit, who would guide them into all truth and make their writings the inerrant Word of God.

In conclusion we call attention to some statements in the study document which we believe to be inadequate or unfortunate formulations. We note the following. "Baptism was instituted by Christ for the redemption of the world . . ." (II, F, 37). Have Lutherans not always held that Baptism was instituted by Christ as a means through which the Triune God brings those who are baptized in His name into His fellowship? Again: "It [the Lutheran Church] recognizes other church bodies with their special gifts . . ." (II, G, 39). We suggest: The Lutheran Church recognizes that there are believers, children of God, in other church bodies where the Gospel is still preached. The statement regarding the purpose of the Lord's Supper seems to us inadequate (II, F, 37): "The Lord's Supper is Christ's gift to the congregation for the strengthening of the fellowship with its Head and Lord and the constant realization of the fact that it is His body." Does not Lutheranism teach that the Lord's Supper is, above all, a means of grace in which the Lord Jesus gives His own body and blood for the strengthening of the faith of those who commune? And is it really true that "division within the Church is

*always* [italics ours] the result of arbitrary attempts to add something human to Word and Sacrament as the necessary marks of the Church"? (P.6.) Have not divisions arisen in the church, even in New Testament times, for other reasons?

We pray that the Lord of the Church will richly bless all the efforts of the Minneapolis Assembly to arrive at a truly Scriptural and God-pleasing consensus regarding the study document. What Minneapolis will do with the study document may spell either a greater degree of unity and of unification within Lutheranism, or greater and sharper divisions. Since it is the Holy Spirit who alone creates and preserves the unity in Christ, may He guide and direct all thought and activity in the Assembly.

St. Louis, Mo.



# Contrition

By THEODORE ENGELDER

Translated by H. J. A. BOUMAN and ERWIN LUEKER

(Continued)

[ED. NOTE: The title of the original article was stated erroneously in the first translated installment, which appeared in the previous issue. It is *Zur Lehre von der Reue*.]

## III

DOES repentance follow faith? Such a question seems strange to Lutherans. We teach: "Now, repentance consists properly of these two parts: One is contrition, that is, terrors smiting the conscience through the knowledge of sin; the other is faith, which is born of the Gospel" (AC XII). Faith is "the chief part of repentance" (Ap XII 58, German Text). No, repentance, the essential characteristic of which is faith, cannot follow faith. Calvin and his adherents, however, teach that repentance follows faith. They obviously have a concept of repentance different from ours. The Reformed usage has contributed to the great confusion which reigns within the Christian Church concerning the doctrine of contrition and repentance. In the following we shall present what the Reformed have in mind when they let repentance follow faith, and we shall show how false and harmful this opinion is.

Book three, chapter three, of Calvin's *Institutiones* treats of repentance. There we read: "Repentance being properly understood, it will better appear how a man is justified freely by faith alone, and yet that holiness of life, *real* holiness, as it is called, is inseparable from the free imputation of righteousness. That repentance not only always follows faith, but is produced by it, ought to be without controversy. . . . Repentance may not inappropriately be defined thus: A real conversion of our life unto God, proceeding from sincere and serious fear of God and consisting in the mortification of our flesh and the old man and the quickening of the spirit. . . . As repentance begins with dread and hatred of sin, the apostle sets down godly sorrow as one of its causes (2 Cor. 7:10). By godly sorrow he means when we not only tremble at the punishment, but hate and abhor the sin because we know that it is displeasing to God. . . . We must now show what is meant

when we say that repentance consists of two parts, viz., the mortification of the flesh and the quickening of the spirit. The prophets, in accommodation to a carnal people, express this in simple and homely terms, but clearly, when they say: 'Depart from evil and do good' (Ps. 34:14; Is. 1:16, 17). In dissuading us from wickedness, they demand the entire destruction of the flesh. . . . In a word, then, by repentance I understand regeneration, the only aim of which is to form in us anew the image of God" (Translation by H. Beveridge). It is clear that for Calvin the term *repentance*, or *conversion*, denotes holy sorrow concomitant with faith and the turning away from sin to righteousness. This terminology, according to which repentance indeed follows faith, has found widespread usage in Reformed theology.

Chapter XIV of the *Second Helvetic Confession*, "De poenitentia et conversione hominis," par. 2, reads: "By repentance (*poenitentia*) we mean the change of mind in the sinful man which is wrought by the Holy Spirit through the Gospel and accepted in true faith, in consequence of which the sinful man pleads guilty of his inbred depravity and of all his sins which the Word of God charges against him, and heartily grieves over his sins not only before God, but also is filled with a violent aversion to them and is earnestly concerned with immediate improvement and the constant exercise of holiness and virtue, and dedicates all future days of his life to this holy task." Par. 3 continues: "Now this is the true repentance, the sincere conversion to God and all that is good, the emphatic renunciation of the devil and all that is evil." Par. 13 then demonstrates that this mortifying of the flesh may not be regarded as atonement for sin, but rather is a part of the new obedience that results from gratitude for the perfect atonement offered by Christ.

*The Heidelberg Catechism* treats the doctrine of repentance in the same manner as Calvin. "Of how many parts does the genuine repentance or conversion of man consist? Of two parts: the mortification of the old man and the resurrection of the new. What is the mortification of the old man? To be heartily sorry for sins and to hate and avoid them, the longer the more. What is the resurrection of the new man? To experience heartfelt joy in God and a loving desire to live according to God's will in all good

works" (Qus. 88—90).<sup>1</sup> If further elucidation concerning the place assigned to repentance in the order of salvation [in Reformed theology] is needed, we point to Thomas Apple, *The Organic Structure of the Heidelberg Catechism*: "In the third part of the catechism, which treats of Thankfulness, we have set forth what man is moved to do toward God in return for his deliverance. The first subject presented is that of Conversion, or, as it is in the German, True Repentance. . . . In his full and lucid argument on the subject of repentance, Calvin remarks 'that repentance not only immediately follows faith, but is produced by it.' . . . This mortification of the old man and quickening of the new man is nothing else than the death and resurrection of Christ operating in the Christian. The calls to repentance generally in the Bible are addressed to those who are in covenant relation with God. 'Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand,' said John the Baptist and the Savior—in which it is implied that repentance is possible only where the grace of the Gospel kingdom comes to man" (*Tercentenary Monument*, p. 354). A. C. Whitmer in his *Notes on the Heidelberg Catechism* expresses the Reformed concept of repentance in the same way: "The catechism regards conversion not only as a painful sense of sin, but also and especially

<sup>1</sup> Here we may call attention to the fact that the *mortificatio* and *vivificatio* referred to above are something quite different from the *mortificatio* and *vivificatio* which according to Scripture constitute the two elements of repentance. "St. Paul in all his epistles, as often as he treats of how we are converted, draws these two things together: the *death of the old man*, that is, contrition, fear of God's wrath and judgment, and, secondly, *renewal* by faith. For through faith we are comforted and restored to life" (Ap XII 46). *Mortificatio* is brought about by the Law, in contrition, and designates the shattering of self-righteousness and self-trust, so that man is driven to "terror and despair" (SA—III III). In addition to this, our Confessions know of a mortification of the old man that takes place as a result of conversion, namely, the drowning of the old Adam by daily contrition and repentance. John Gerhard: "Are *mortificatio* and *vivificatio* the components of repentance? If *mortificatio* signifies contrition, or the agony arising from recognition of sin and God's wrath, and if *vivificatio* signifies the comfort and peace of conscience conveyed by faith, then we agree. However, if *mortificatio* means renouncing sin and malice, and if *vivificatio* means the activity of sanctification, then we must assign them to the fruits of repentance. The truly penitent person renounces evil and does good (Ps. 34:14; Is. 1:17). In this sense Calvin, Bucanus, and Polanus use these terms as a description of repentance. Here we do not agree with them, because the daily mortification of the old man and the renewal of the new man are a fruit of faith" (*Locus de poenitentia*, Cap. VII, 56). "It is, therefore, wrong for Joh. Crocius to allege that the Apology defines repentance in the same way as the Calvinists" (Huelsemann, *Praelect. in librum Conc., De Poenitentia*, IX).

as a joyful experience, a daily growing holy desire and purpose to show our thankfulness by living for Christ (Rom. 6:19-22). Conversion, in this view, is possible, of course, only in Christians. . . . Conversion and sanctification are respectively the human and the divine side of the process" (pp. 193—205). Man must first be brought to faith before the Reformed preacher will speak to him of repentance or conversion.

Whitmer is not consistent. In the midst of his discussion of repentance he devotes a special paragraph to the "Conversion of Adults." "How about those who grow up unconverted? Evidently their conversion must be different from that of those who yield their hearts to the Holy Ghost. . . . They may come to this turning-point, to a true penitence for sins and faith in Christ, either gradually, through months, after much thought, ending in a calm and intelligent resolution to live a new life, or suddenly, in which case the act will not be so safe and trustworthy" (pp. 200f.). Here repentance (contrition) and faith are called the two parts of conversion and are presented in the Scriptural order: penitence and faith. The writer should have realized that Calvin's outline will not do. He should also have asked himself how a reader of this explanation of the catechism would fare. First he is told that before he can become converted he must become a Christian. Then, however, he is told that one becomes a Christian by being converted, that is, by way of contrition and faith.

*The Westminster Confession* agrees with *The Heidelberg Catechism* and Calvin. Chapter XIV treats "Of Saving Faith" and Chapter XV "Of Repentance unto Life." There we read: "Repentance unto life is an evangelical grace. . . . By it a sinner, out of the sight and sense, not only of the danger, but also of the filthiness and odiousness of his sin, as contrary to the holy nature and righteous Law of God, and upon the apprehension of His mercy in Christ to such as are penitent, so grieves for, and hates, his sins as to turn from them all unto God, purposing and endeavoring to walk with Him in all the ways of His commandments." Robert Shaw comments as follows: "It is an apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ, by faith, that melts the heart into penitential sorrow for sin. Of so generous a nature is evangelical repentance that the penitent soul is never so deeply humbled and grieved for

sin as when it has reason to hope that a gracious God has freely forgiven it. . . . In the order of nature, faith must precede repentance. Evangelical repentance is a turning from sin to God; but there can be no turning to God except through Christ and no coming to Christ but by believing in Him, John 14:6; 6:35" (*An Exposition of the Confession of Faith*, pp. 180f.). Also in *The Shorter Catechism* repentance is presented as following faith (Qus. 86 and 87), while, strangely enough, Qu. 153 of *The Larger Catechism* inverts the order: "That we may escape the wrath and curse of God due to us by reason of the transgression of the Law, He requires of us repentance towards God and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ." *The Standard Catechism* of the Methodists likewise describes repentance in this way: "What is repentance? Repentance is the turning from sin to God, the surrender of every principle and motive of conduct that is contrary to the law of love and the welfare of the kingdom of God" (Qu. 116).

It is true, not all Reformed theologians let repentance follow faith. Many describe the matter in this way: "The first step in the upward path which we have therefore now to describe is Repentance. . . . The first element in repentance is awakening. . . . A second is fear. . . . A third element is a vision of good. . . . A fourth element is confession. . . . A fifth element is decision. . . . As has been seen above, the first step upwards, out of unrighteousness towards Christian character, is repentance; and now we go on to the second, which is faith" (James Stalker, *The Ethic of Jesus*, pp. 155—175). "It is with repentance and faith, as elements in that first and radical change (conversion) by which the soul enters upon a state of salvation, that we have now to do" (Augustus H. Strong, *Systematic Theology*, p. 461). To be sure, the repentance that is explained here, namely, contrition which precedes faith, is not described correctly by Stalker nor by Strong. The latter defines repentance not only as "recognition of sin as involving personal guilt, defilement, and helplessness," but also as "sorrow for sin committed against goodness and justice and therefore hateful to God and hateful in itself," as "an inward turning from sin and disposition to seek pardon and cleansing." The contrition of the unconverted is lumped together with the contrition of the be-

liever. But our immediate concern at this point is to demonstrate that many Reformed place repentance before faith.

The customary Reformed manner of speaking is, however, that *repentance* follows faith. We read: "Faith and repentance, according to the Scriptures, are the fruits of regeneration" (Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, III, 601). "Though faith and repentance are inseparable and simultaneous, yet in the order of nature, faith precedes repentance. . . . (a) Faith leads to repentance, not repentance to faith. . . . (b) Repentance involves turning to God, but there can be no turning but through Christ. . . . (c) If repentance precedes faith, then it stands between the sinner and Christ. The sinner cannot go to Christ 'just as he is,' but must first make certain that he has repented. (d) If repentance precedes faith, then none but the penitent man is invited to believe in Christ. . . . (e) The doctrine that repentance precedes faith tends to make repentance legal, that is, a reason why Christ should accept the sinner. (f) God out of Christ and irrespective of faith in Christ is a consuming fire. It is impossible to have godly sorrow with this view of God" (William Shedd, *Dogmatic Theology*, II, 536).<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> "In harmony with the *Geneva Catechism* Calvin knows only of a *poenitentia* that proceeds from *fides*, consisting in the ongoing *mortificatio* and *vivificatio* or *renovatio*" (F. A. Philippi, *Kirchliche Glaubenslehre*, V, 121). "The sources are indefinite regarding the process of appropriating salvation and the transformation of the sinner. . . . It must be remembered that the Reformed Symbols do not speak here in the first place of the repentance that is to be produced by the preaching of the Law. *Lex et poenitentia* (*resipiscentia*) are treated by them at a different place [cf. the place assigned to the Decalog in their catechisms]" (G. Plitt, *Grundriss der Symbolik*, p. 113). "In contradistinction to the Lutheran teaching that contrition, or repentance, wrought by the Law, precedes faith, Calvin maintains that repentance follows faith. . . . He admits 'that many are overcome or led to obedience by terrors of conscience before they have imbibed a knowledge of grace' (*Inst.* III, 3, par. 2), but this he would not call repentance. Nor is it necessary that a person pass through this 'initial fear,' these terrors of conscience, for Christ has many ways to draw us to Himself" (E. H. Klotsche, *Christian Symbolics*, p. 219). As for the latter point, also Herzog-Hauck, RE, s. v. "Busse," says that "Calvin does not emphasize the preceding *terrores* in the doctrine of repentance." In general we may say that present-day Reformed theology emphasizes the necessity of the knowledge of sin as produced by the Law. In this the Reformed follow the lead of J. G. Machen: "Although Christianity does not end with the broken heart, it does begin with the broken heart. The consciousness of sin was formerly (before liberalism gained control) the starting-point of all preaching. . . . If the consciousness of sin is to be produced, the Law of God must be proclaimed" (*Christianity and Liberalism*, pp. 64f.). Likewise Shedd: "Conviction, a sense of guilt and danger, when men are convicted of sin and utter helplessness, is preparatory or antecedent to regeneration" (*Dogm. Theol.*, II, 511 ff.).

We shall not now enter into the error in Shedd's argumentation. Here we only want to establish that it is a genuinely Reformed way of speaking to say that repentance follows faith.<sup>3</sup> And that is an improper use of terminology and even involves an admixture of false doctrine.

When we reject the Reformed article concerning repentance, we do not imply that the doctrine of justification per se is impaired by the statement: repentance follows faith. [We recognize that] by saying that faith does not belong to the essence of repentance they do not mean to oppose the article which they firmly confess, namely, that the sinner is justified by faith alone. The point is, that they do not use the term "repentance" in the same sense as do we, who say that man obtains salvation by way of repentance, or of conversion, which consists essentially in coming to faith. Their terms and ours do not connote the same things. We would likewise be missing the point if we were to fault the Reformed for saying that it is impossible to demand the mortification of the old man and the resurrection of the new man of an unconverted or unbelieving person. They would answer that they are not doing this; but that they are dealing with believers when they speak of the mortification of the old man. Since the Reformed define the term *repentance* not as we do, we may not label as incorrect such of their statements as according to our definition of repentance would indeed be wrong.

It is clear from Shedd's presentation that the Reformed operate with a concept of repentance different from ours. The basis for his thesis "faith precedes repentance" is valid only on the supposition—a supposition which we do not accept—that repentance always designates only the mortification of the old man. His argument, among others, is: "The doctrine that repentance precedes faith tends to make repentance legal, that is, a reason why Christ should accept the sinner." This stricture would be valid only if with the Reformed we equated repentance with sanctification; [we agree] of course, that sanctification may not be placed before faith.

<sup>3</sup> So also Schneckenburger: "These are, in general, *fides* and *resipiscentia*, and in that order for the Reformed. A Lutheran prefers *contritio* to *resipiscentia* and inverts the order: Repentance precedes faith" (*Vergleichende Darstellung des luth. u. ref. Lehrbegriffs*, p. 117).

It would not be valid, however, in those instances where repentance is understood in the sense of the knowledge of sins, the *terrores conscientiae*, which precede faith. Shedd himself lets this anxiety concerning sin, which he calls conviction of sin, precede faith. He knows as well as we that the sinner is not entitled to claim forgiveness on this basis. Furthermore [he says]: "God out of Christ and irrespective of faith in Christ is a consuming fire, Deut. 4:24; Heb. 12:29. With this view of God it is impossible to have godly sorrow. Only remorse and terror are possible." Every word of this is, in itself, true. But it has nothing to do with his thesis. It is certainly true that before coming to faith the heart of the sinner can experience only terrors, the terrors of hell. Here is no holy sorrow, sorrow motivated by love to God. This holy sorrow most certainly follows faith. But there is also a sorrow that is a terror of hell. This precedes faith. Shedd, however, proceeds as if this question is of no concern in the discussion of the word "repentance." Note also this argument: "Repentance involves turning to God; but there can be no turning but through Christ, John 14:6; 10:9." Again the argument is based on the opinion that repentance is only an aversion to sin—something which indeed is possible only in the power of Christ. In addition, another difference in defining concepts among the Reformed and the Lutherans becomes apparent in this connection. We call repentance also the conversion to God by faith, the kindling of faith. The "coming to the Father" (John 14:6), in our terminology, means "to be brought to faith." The Reformed call repentance a turning away from sin toward the God of holiness, and use John 14:6 in that sense. In short, their definition of repentance differs essentially from ours.

It is this definition of theirs that we reject as false. The Reformed definition of repentance is not Scriptural. In speaking of repentance, or conversion, Scripture does not refer exclusively to the mortification of the old man. Its primary emphasis is something else. Repentance as used in Scripture connotes, above all, the kindling of faith in a man's heart. "A great number believed and turned unto the Lord" (Acts 11:21). The conversion took place in their coming to faith (πιστεύσας). Scripture often uses the word *repentance* in the sense of conversion, and by it designates the coming to faith. "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish" (Luke



12:3, 5). What is the nature of this repentance, whereby a man is saved from perdition? "What must I do to be saved?" — "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved and thy house" (Acts 16:30f.). According to Scripture it is one and the same thing to say that the man who repents obtains salvation, and that the man who comes to faith obtains salvation. St. Luke 15 treats *ex professo* of repentance, of "the sinner that repents." The parables describe this repentance as the process by which the shepherd finds the lost sheep and by which the prodigal son returns to his father. A Reformed theologian will hardly deny that the lost sinner returns to the Father precisely in this way, that he by faith accepts Jesus as his Savior.

Try to read the Scriptures according to the Reformed concept of repentance. "Except you repent, you will perish" — [would mean] if you want to escape eternal damnation, you must out of love to God be sorry for your sins and kill the old man. "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins" (Acts 2:38) — practice the evangelical virtue of renunciation of sin, and receive forgiveness in Baptism. "John preached the Baptism of repentance for the remission of sins" (Mark 1:4) — John preached Baptism, which is concerned with sanctification, for the remission of sins. "Repent; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matt. 3:2) — the Savior is now establishing His kingdom on earth, and what is the great message that is addressed to men? Believe in the Savior? Not at all, but: You must kill the old man. According to Reformed usage, Christ did not come to call sinners to repentance (Luke 5:32), but to incite the righteous toward the exercise of righteousness. Truly, Scripture cannot be squared with the Reformed definition of repentance.

According to the Reformed mode of teaching, it is not permissible to describe repentance as including contrition, that is, the knowledge of sin produced by the Law. They say that the word *repent* refers exclusively to daily contrition. But whenever Scripture describes this matter more fully, it always points to the knowledge of sin and the terror that precede faith. For example, Acts 16:29: "He came trembling"; Acts 2:37: "They were pricked in their heart"; Joel 2:12: "Rend your hearts." With Scripture

we let this contrition precede faith, and we designate it as a part of conversion: "Repent — and believe the Gospel." According to Shedd, this will not do. Repentance is always "godly sorrow; it is impossible to have godly sorrow with this view of God — as a consuming fire; there only remorse and terror are possible." Shedd must learn that God has begun the work of repentance in the sinner when God reveals His wrath to him and creates this contrition of the Law in him.

It is wrong for Calvin to set up this thesis: "Repentance always follows faith." What embarrassment must come to him from all those Scripture texts which observe the opposite order! "Repent and believe the Gospel" (Mark 1:15). "Testifying . . . repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ" (Acts 20:21). This protest of Scripture against Calvin's rule is so strong that occasionally the Reformed forsake the order prescribed by Calvin, as for instance, in *The Larger Catechism*, which quotes the above-mentioned Scripture texts as prooftexts in just this connection.

Calvin indeed insists that his usage does no violence to Scripture. He says in answer to our view: "Christ and John, it is said, in their discourses first exhort the people to repentance and then add that the kingdom of heaven is at hand. Such, too, is the message which the apostles received, and such the course which Paul followed, as is narrated by Luke (Acts 15:21). But clinging superstitiously to the juxtaposition of syllables, they attend not to the coherence of meaning in the words. For when our Lord and John begin their preaching thus: 'Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand,' Matt. 3:2, do they not deduce repentance as a consequence of the offer of grace and promise of salvation?" He contends for the view that the members of Christ's kingdom renounce sin and lead a godly life in consequence of the gracious forgiveness of sins. This we do not oppose at all. But we do oppose the thought that it is the natural and proper thing in the proclamation of the beginning of the kingdom of the King of Grace to omit the main thing, namely, the entrance into the kingdom of Christ by faith, and to place all the emphasis on what is not the main thing. Shedd must resort to a desperate exegesis. He closes his explanation, referred to above, with the words: "In such passages as Mark 1:15: 'Repent ye, and believe the Gospel,' and Acts 20:21

the end is mentioned first and the means last. In a proposition, a term may have a position *verbally* which it has not logically." We have no objection to the last statement. But we do object when repentance that initiates Christ's kingdom and is the source of joy for the angels of God is conceived of by Calvin and Shedd and others exclusively and primarily as a daily repentance, or sanctification. This gives us pause. We shall pursue this matter further in the next article.

The Reformed usage contradicts the usage of Scripture. This is true even if the Reformed were to say that their concept of repentance is a Scriptural one and that they say nothing but what Luther himself said. It is true, Scripture teaches that out of love for his Savior the Christian daily bemoans his sin and applies himself with all his powers to the task of killing the old Adam. It is true, Luther has much to say of daily contrition and repentance, whereby the old Adam is drowned and a new man daily comes forth who lives forever in righteousness and holiness before God. Luther says that the believer's entire life on earth should be a constant and unceasing repentance (St. Louis XVIII, 71). "In Christians this repentance continues until death, because through the entire life it contends with the sin remaining in the flesh" (SA—III III, 40; cf. LC IV 74f.). "As semper poenitentes we are, so to speak, all that we should be as Christians, namely, semper peccatores . . . et tamen eo ipso et iusti sumus et iustificamur, partim peccatores, partim iusti, i. e., nihil nisi poenitentes" (R. Hermann, *Luthers These "Gerecht und Sünder zugleich,"* p. 247. Cf. Luther's *Vorlesung über den Römerbrief*, Ficker, II, 267).

Certainly there is a continuous, daily repentance. So far we agree with the Reformed. In two points, however, we do not agree with them. In two points the Reformed presentation does not agree with Scripture. First, we understand daily repentance to mean contrition and faith, with the emphasis on faith. We think primarily of the fact that the Christian, every day sinful and wretched, receives from his gracious Savior forgiveness. "The daily repentance of the Christians (*poenitentia stantium*) is rightly called a daily return to Baptism or to the baptismal covenant. Those who are in faith daily acknowledge themselves to be sinners, by faith appropriate the forgiveness of sins promised in Baptism, and, thus comforted,

strive for fruits meet for repentance in a new life" (Francis Pieper, *Christliche Dogmatik*, III, 323 f.). The Reformed definition, however, makes no mention of faith. Only this is stated: "It consists in the mortification of our flesh and the old man and the quickening of the spirit." Secondly, it is not Scriptural for them to insist that repentance means nothing more than their concept of daily repentance, contrition, and fighting against sin. Scripture includes more, namely this, that the terrified sinner is brought to faith in the Savior and then, in his anxiety over his sins, takes daily refuge with his Savior. When the call "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is nigh at hand" (Matt. 3:2) is sounded, the sinners are invited to acknowledge their sins and to believe in Jesus, the King of the Kingdom of Grace. No, say the Reformed, this call is addressed to those who are already in faith. It is true, they are within Scripture when they speak to the believer concerning the necessity of the dying of the old man and the resurrection of the new. But they are outside Scripture when they limit the concept of repentance to this. Their terminology is not Scriptural. It is also entirely according to Scripture for Shedd to say that regeneration can be effected only in one who has come to a knowledge of his sins. He calls this process "conviction of sin." We do not object to the expression "conviction of sin," for that is correct. It is wrong, however, to refuse to include this in the concept of repentance. St. Matthew includes it. The words of judgment spoken by John the Baptist in announcing the coming wrath of God to the sinners belong to the exposition of the theme "Repent Ye!" Thus the Reformed do not use Scriptural language in their definition of repentance.

This results in a hopeless confusion. Thereby they confound the Scriptures and thus also the understanding of the reader. They keep him from understanding Scripture. A Christian, held captive by the Reformed view, will be amazed by the statement "Repent, and believe the Gospel," and he will ask: Why doesn't the Savior say what according to our rule He ought to say: Believe in the Gospel and repent? Why, in Luke 24:47, does He first mention repentance and then forgiveness of sins? The proper way to say it would be, "Preach the forgiveness of sins and repentance resulting from forgiveness." Does not the third chapter of St. Matthew also

appear contrary to the proper order? John preaches, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is nigh at hand." According to the Reformed Christian, this is addressed to the children of God. How, then, can he call them "generation of vipers"? Why does he deny that they are God's children? Why does he say, "Even now the ax is laid to the root of the trees"? We read further that as a result of John's preaching of repentance many were baptized and confessed their sins. Matthew should have written that John preached repentance to them after they had entered the kingdom of heaven through Baptism. Again, since the knowledge of sin and the terrors of sin are not included in the concept of repentance, why is the incisive preaching of the Law by John called preaching of repentance? Furthermore, the Christian thinking along Reformed lines will find it difficult to reconcile that in the repentance chapter (Luke 15) the reason of the Shepherd's joy is said to consist in the fact that He has found the lost sheep, that the man who was lost in sin is saved by faith, with this, that, oddly enough, the cause of the joy of the angels of God is placed not so much in the great fact of the sinner's salvation as rather in his holy life. The Reformed reader of Scripture will become confused.<sup>4</sup>

Worst of all, this confusion extends also to the area of the doctrine of salvation. A careful study of the Reformed treatment of this matter reveals false doctrine.

The Reformed thesis, "Repentance follows faith; by repentance the Scriptures mean the holy contrition of the Christian and renewal," does violence to the language of Scripture as shown in the preceding. But in this instance more is at stake than merely an unfortunate terminology. It is a matter of false teaching. The strict

<sup>4</sup> In this matter Lutheran theology simply follows Scripture and, for that reason, speaks of repentance in various frames of reference. Sometimes Scripture uses the word to cover the entire conversion of man. In that case *repent* means: Acknowledge and rue your sins, and believe in the Lord Jesus Christ (Luke 13:5; 15:7). Elsewhere Scripture distinguishes between repentance and faith in Christ. Here repentance refers to what precedes faith, a change of attitude with regard to sin, the knowledge of sin and the fear of God's wrath (Mark 1:15; Acts 20:21; Luke 24:47. Cf. FC SD V 7 f.). Scripture furthermore states that those who have been converted are converted daily (Matt. 18:3) as long as they live, as this is expressed in the penitential psalms. They are sorry for their sin, they find consolation in Christ, they renounce sin. Hence we speak of a daily contrition and repentance. Just follow Scripture, eliminate none of the concepts with which Scripture designates repentance, and Scripture will remain for you a clear book.

application of the statement that by repentance the Scriptures always mean the daily renewal leads inevitably to false doctrine. Moreover, the willingness of the Reformed to draw the conclusions consistent with the statement arises from a false doctrinal position: the basic legalistic tendency of Reformed theology.

In order to support their thesis, the Reformed are compelled to use indiscriminately the passages of Scripture which speak of a daily repentance and the passages of Scripture which ascribe the attainment of salvation to repentance and conversion. The result of this is the doctrine that contrition and sanctification work salvation. When *The Westminster Confession* treats repentance in the 15th chapter and describes it as daily contrition and sanctification it quotes without hesitation Acts 11:18: "Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life"; Luke 13:3,5: "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish"; and Acts 17:30: "But now commandeth all men everywhere to repent." This suggests the following line of thought to the reader: Scripture attaches salvation to repentance; repentance consists in mortifying the old man. Thus the activity of sanctification effects salvation. To be sure, *The Westminster Confession* still wants to cling to justification by grace alone. It says: "Although repentance be not to be rested in as any satisfaction for sin or any cause of the pardon thereof, which is the act of God's free grace in Christ." But then it continues: "Yet it is of such necessity to all sinners that none may expect pardon without it." This says more than that the person who lives in sins cannot console himself with forgiveness. It says that forgiveness is attached to sanctification in some way. How so? In this way, says R. Shaw in his *Exposition of the Confession of Faith*, p. 183: "God, for the vindication of the honor of the plan of mercy, has so connected pardon with repentance and confession, the expression of repentance, that they are the only certain evidences that we are in a pardoned state, while pardon and repentance are equally the gift of God through Jesus Christ." This means that the amendment of life does, indeed, not work the forgiveness but the certainty of the forgiveness; the sinner is directed to depend on good works in order to gain certainty of salvation. The next paragraph in the Confession reads: "As there is no sin so small but it deserves damnation, so there is no sin so great that it can bring

damnation upon those who truly repent." The *Exposition* illustrates: "David, after his 'great transgression,' and Peter, after his denial of his Master, repented and were pardoned." When a Lutheran reads these words, he finds expressed in them the blessed truth that the penitent sinner, the sinner who has come to faith, obtains forgiveness. The Reformed person, on the other hand, for whom repentance is identical with sanctification, finds in them the basis for a horrible doctrine.

*The Shorter Catechism* teaches: "To escape the wrath and curse of God, due to us for sin, God requireth of us faith in Jesus Christ, repentance unto life, with the diligent use of all the outward means, etc. What is faith in Jesus Christ? Faith in Jesus Christ is a saving grace, whereby we receive, and rest upon Him alone for salvation. . . . What is repentance unto life? Repentance unto life is a saving grace, whereby a sinner, out of a true sense of his sin and apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ, doth, with grief and hatred of his sin, turn from it unto God, with full purpose of, and endeavor after, new obedience." (Qus. 85—87. Cf. *The Larger Catechism*, Qu. 153). Let a Lutheran see if he is able to utter this sentence: In order that I can escape the wrath of God I must lead a holy life! Note also that whereas *The Westminster Confession* describes amendment of life as evangelical grace, *The Shorter Catechism* uses the expression *saving* grace exactly as it characterizes faith: Faith is a saving grace. Repentance is a saving grace.

All this Calvin taught. In the third chapter of the third book of the *Institutiones* he asserts again and again: "Not that repentance is properly the cause of salvation" (par. 21). But again and again he speaks of the necessity of repentance for salvation (the Reformed repentance): "When once the thought that God will one day ascend His tribunal to take an account of all words and actions has taken possession of his mind, it will not allow him to rest or have one moment's peace, but will perpetually urge him to adopt a different plan of life that he may be able to stand securely at that judgment-seat" (par. 7). "Christ came to call sinners, but to call them to repentance. He was sent to bless the unworthy, but by 'turning away everyone' 'from his iniquities.' . . . 'Let the wicked forsake his way and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let

him return unto the Lord, and He will have mercy upon him.' 'Repent ye, therefore, and be converted that your sins may be blotted out' (Acts 3:19). Here, however, it is to be observed that repentance is not made a condition in such a sense as to be a foundation for meriting pardon; nay, it rather indicates the end at which they must aim if they would obtain favor, God having resolved to take pity on men for the express purpose of leading them to repent" (par. 20). In one breath Calvin can say that the sinner is justified by grace alone and that he must exercise repentance "if he wants to attain grace." Are we unfair to him? The Reformed theologian M. Schneckenburger concludes just as we do that Calvin draws works into the treatment of justification. He writes in his *Comparative Presentation of the Lutheran and Reformed Doctrinal System*: "As surely as, e. g., works are excluded from the *negotium iustificationis* as the act between God and the sinner, so definitely is the consciousness of justification for the sinner himself made dependent upon the exercise in good works, proving himself in the new obedience. . . . This whole conception is intolerable to the Lutheran. That man first through the activity of his will, through his good works, becomes certain of his own faith would mean in effect to rob him of all confidence of faith, to condemn him to a new unrest of work-righteousness, and make his justification doubtful" (I, 40f.). "From the viewpoint of Lutherans, the *salus* as eternal salvation is the immediate consequence of *iustificatio* and *filiatio* and is potentially contained in these; from the viewpoint of the Reformed the *possessio salutis* must be differentiated from the *ius*, which justification alone gives, and is to be realized through works; thus the certainty of the *possessio salutis* is not yet given with the unstable and fluid consciousness of justification but only with the activity of the pious life which arises from this consciousness and raises the same out of the area of the subjectively desired to objective reality" (par. 268). The certainty of salvation, then, does not come simultaneously with faith but must be derived from works. The Reformed repentance, holy contrition, and amendment of life effects salvation! Finally, "*Just as salvation is attained through faith to the extent that it really exercises good works*" [italics ours], "so justification, as certainty of the state of grace, is attained *through faith to the extent that it works fruits of con-*



version. . . . The *mortificatio* and *vivificatio* as conversion continually realized in action is the practical behavior directed at one's own self, even as the *bona opera* are the direction of activity to the outside; only by this twofold activity can one become certain of one's faith" (II, 131). When we accuse the Reformed of teaching that works are necessary to be certain of salvation, yes, even to attain salvation, Schneckenburger assures us that we do not do them an injustice.

[Here a section in the original article demonstrates that the Reformed have been consistent in their teaching on repentance.]

The theology of the Reformed has a strongly developed legal character. It is generally known that the article on justification is not the center of Reformed theology. The Reformed K. Hagenbach states, for example: "Certainly he [Zwingli], as well as Luther, subscribed to the Pauline doctrine of justification; but in his case it did not occupy such a prominent position" (*Kirchengeschichte*, p. 436). The article on predestination, on the sovereignty of God, is of primary importance for the Reformed theologian. The conception of God, which is basic for his thought, is not that of a gracious God, who by grace for Christ's sake forgives sin, but that of the Almighty and All-Holy, whose will must carry through, who is primarily concerned with obedience to His commandments. The whole theological thought of the Reformed, therefore, does not have an evangelical, but a legal frame of reference. We want to make that clear in three points.

1. The Gospel is a law for the Reformed which imposes duties on man and establishes conditions [to be met]. In defining the Gospel, Hodge uses nothing but legal terminology. "Being a proclamation of the terms on which God is willing to save sinners and an exhibition of the duty of fallen man in relation to that plan, it [the Gospel] of necessity binds all those who are in the condition which the plan contemplates. It is in this respect analogous to the Moral Law" (Hodge, II, 642). What are the prescribed conditions? "The terms of admission into this spiritual kingdom are faith and repentance" (op. cit., p. 610). According to this view, the Gospel operates with conditions, with conditions of a legal nature, with sanctification (repentance in the Reformed sense). Faith itself is characterized as a condition and as duty and is placed on the

same level with repentance. This mingling of Law and Gospel is characteristic of Reformed theology since the days of Zwingli. "Zwingli does not perceive that the Law is the expression of a different world view; unconsciously the Gospel becomes for him a new law" (Seeberg, *Dogmengesch.*, II, 299). Conversely — in the nature of the case — Zwingli does not hesitate to designate the Law as a gospel. "The Law is nothing else than the eternal unchangeable will of God. . . . But, really, it is then in itself nothing else than a gospel [according to the Reformed view], that is, a good, sure, message from God by which He informs us of His will" (Frank, *Die Theol. d. Concordienformel*, II, 312). Schneckenburger agrees completely with this judgment of Zwingli's theology: "Thus Zwingli calls gospel everything 'that God reveals to men and demands of men'; the gospel 'contains command, prohibition, bidding, performance'" (*Comparative Presentation*, I, 128). The Reformed doctrine of salvation is of a legal nature.

2. According to Reformed teaching, the certainty of salvation is based on the efforts of man. According to Reformed teaching a person cannot become certain of his salvation from the Gospel; for the Gospel knows only a particular grace. Moreover, it does not offer grace — the Spirit deals immediately with man. Therefore the matter comes to this: "To the extent that the enthusiasts set aside the doctrine of the means of grace, they are compelled to direct the sinner asking about the grace of God to an *immediately* effected renewal in the heart of man as basis for his confidence in the grace of God. But this is a doctrine of works. Besides one must not forget that this immediate working of the Spirit to which the enthusiasts from Zwingli and Calvin to Hodge and Shedd direct a poor sinner exists only in the human imagination. . . . So a person who has come under the treatment of a consistent enthusiast can do nothing else than produce *out of himself*, out of his own *natural* inner self, such moods of the soul, conditions, changes and works, as have an external similarity to the genuine product of the Holy Spirit and to found his faith on them" (*Lehre und Wehre*, LXXI, 256; cf. Pieper, *Chr. Dog.*, III, 168). "Because the Calvinists teach particular grace and an immediate operation of grace, they must lead consciences smitten by the Law to base the favor of God on *gratia infusa*, on an internal change, i. e., on

sanctification and good works instead of on the means of grace" (Pieper, *Chr. Dog.*, III, 247). That is what the Reformed actually do. "Repentance and confession are the only certain evidences that we are in a pardoned state" (Shaw, *Exposition*). Shedd expresses it thus: "If from his present experience and daily life he has reason to think he is truly a believing Christian, then he has reason to expect that he will continue to be one" (*Dog. Theol.*, II, 558). The Lutheran is sure of his ground because he clings to the promise of the Gospel, not primarily because he leads a holy life. So the Lutheran also bases the certainty of his perseverance on the promise of the Gospel alone. The Reformed person thinks legalistically, thinks in this matter primarily of works.

3. Hence it comes about that in Reformed theology, which, to be sure, teaches justification by faith alone, nevertheless emphasis is not placed on justification, on faith in the gracious forgiveness of sins offered in the Gospel, but on sanctification. How do the Reformed, e. g., understand regeneration? We have presented that at some length in the previous article but want to repeat it here because it characterizes so plainly the legalistic mode of thought of the Reformed. How, then, does Calvin understand the passage "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God"? He thinks primarily of sanctification! "In one word, then, by repentance I understand regeneration, the only aim of which is to form in us anew the image of God. . . . Accordingly, through the blessing of Christ we are renewed by that regeneration into the righteousness of God from which we had fallen through Adam" (loc. cit., par. 9). The definition which the Savior gives of regeneration — "that whosoever believeth in Him shall not perish" (John 3:16) — is not the chief point in Calvin's definition. Indeed, the pertinent chapter has the title "Regeneration by Faith. Repentance." But in the preface we read — and this is very significant: "The title of the chapter seems to promise a treatise on faith; but the only subject here considered is repentance, the inseparable attendant of faith." Thus even in the presentation of the concept regeneration very little is said about faith.<sup>5</sup> *The Presbyterian of*

<sup>5</sup> In connection with the passage "He that hath begun a good work in you will perform it" (Phil. 1:6), Calvin thinks of nothing else but sanctification. "God therefore begins the good work in us by exciting in our hearts a desire,

April 20, 1904, has the same definition: "In effecting the wondrous change, the Spirit acts upon the soul from within, implanting by His creative power a new moral nature or principle of action." For the Lutheran regeneration is essentially generation of saving faith, for the Reformed, essentially "implanting a new moral nature." The Evangelical Catechism also at this point does not deny its Reformed character. "Regeneration is the origin of the new life in man as it is effected by the Triune God through Baptism of the water and the Spirit. Without this new life no man can be saved. . . . In holy Baptism God gives man the basis and the motivation for the Good and for Heaven. . . . (Irion, *The Evangelical Catechism*, pp. 238—242)

Even the sweet evangelical word *faith* receives a legal significance in the language of the Reformed. Faith is, as Hodge explains, one of the duties which the Gospel prescribes, a condition which must be fulfilled. And its essence is defined as obedience to God's command. Article XII of the *Confessio Scoticana* I, which deals with faith, nowhere mentions that faith has the function of taking hold of the forgiveness of sins but says, among other things: "Of nature we are so dead, so blind, and so perverse that neither can we feill when we are pricked, see the licht when it shines, nor assent to the will of God when it is reveiled, unless the Spirit of the Lord Jesus quicken that quihilk is dead, remove the darkness of our myndes, and bowe our stubborn hearts to the obedience of His blessed will." When R. A. Torrey describes the results of regeneration, he enumerates the following parts: the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, the victory over sin, the transformation of life wrought by the renewal of the mind, faith in Christ, the victory over the world, the life in righteousness, love of the brethren, in sum, renewal in every aspect. And then we read: "The fourth result of being born again is that the regenerated man believes that Jesus is the Christ, 1 John 5:1. The faith that John here speaks of is not a faith that is a mere opinion, but that real faith that Jesus is the Anointed of God that leads us to enthrone Jesus as

---

a love, and a study of righteousness, or, to speak more correctly, by turning, training, and guiding our hearts unto righteousness; and He completes this good work by confirming us unto perseverance" (par. 6). Cf. *Conf. Scoticana*, I, Art. XII.

King in our lives. . . . If you are making Jesus King in your heart and life and absolute Ruler of your thoughts and conduct, then you are born again; for 'whosoever believeth that Jesus is Christ is begotten of God'" (*The Fund. Doctrines of the Chr. Faith*, p. 212). Although Torrey in other instances speaks correctly of faith, here, in the framework of the legalistic view of Reformed theology, he places it on a level with renewal in its varied aspects and then consistently describes it as a Christian virtue.

Thus the genuine Reformed theology places the chief emphasis on sanctification. The majority of sectarian preachers tell their listeners that the quintessence of Christianity consists in the fulfillment of the commandments, in the earnest endeavor to live according to God's will. They learned that from their theologians. Stalker: "Repentance, if understood in its full Scriptural sense, is the sum and substance of the Gospel" (*The Ethic of Jesus*, p. 155), and in his definition of repentance he does not mention faith. W. Hendricksen speaks very plainly in his book *The Sermon on the Mount*: "The man who builds his house upon the rock is a picture of the individual who not only hears the Gospel of the Kingdom, the proclamation of the will of the Father, but who also acts upon it, realizing that his life will have abiding value only then when it is built upon the solid foundation of the *doing of God's will, the joyful recognition of God's sovereignty*. . . . Either the fundamental principle of your life is the cheerful recognition of *God's sovereignty, the doing of God's will through the grace of God and out of gratitude*, so that you are building on the Rock Christ, or your house (i. e., your life) has no foundation at all." The Sermon on the Mount emphasizes "the one fundamental principle of Christianity, the very essence and the root-idea of the 'kingdom of God,' namely, obedience to the will of God, joyful recognition of God's *sovereignty*" (pp. 244—248. Instead of italics bold type in the original). What is the chief thing in Reformed theology?

The *Theologische Quartalschrift*<sup>6</sup> hits the mark when it says of Zwingli: "Also in the Gospel, sanctification was so predominantly its real goal for him that righteousness and faith came into con-

<sup>6</sup> Published by The Evangelical Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, Milwaukee, Wis.

sideration only as means for the restoration of the holy life, so that his sermons and writings lack the comfort for all weary and laden consciences and all his teaching of, and all his polemics for, the Scripturalness of the doctrines of the church have just as much a legal character as his admonitions, castigations, and reformatiōns" (1931, p. 16). W. Walther hits the mark when he writes about Calvin: "By regeneration he understands the moral transformation of man . . . 'the Gospel does not concern us until we have entered upon a new life' (*In. III, 3.1*). The faith created by the Spirit of God accepts these *two* proclamations of the Gospel: forgiveness and repentance (*III, 3.11*), obviously therefore also the preaching of repentance or sanctification, inasmuch as without the latter the forgiveness desired by the sinner is not to be obtained. . . . This stress on ethics is found already before the time of Calvin in the Reformed Church. The *Helv. prior* designates as the goal of that 'which we have through the Lord Christ' this: 'He reforms us to the image for which we are created and returns us to it and leads us into the fellowship of His divine life.' The forgiveness of sins is not mentioned here at all; only in the discussion of the Lord's Supper is the remission of sins mentioned once. The amendment of life is the chief concern (*103, 34; 104, 12. 20; 106, 33*). For the Reformed, God is the sovereign Lord who is concerned only with obedience to His commandments" (*Lehrbuch der Symbolik*, pp. 245 f.). Luther hits the mark when he writes: "See, what are our new sects and enthusiasts doing but leading people back to works?" (*SL III, 691. Cf. II, 1828; XI, 1415; XIII, 1917*)

Schneckenburger essentially agrees with this. "Hereby also justification loses the importance which it has for Lutherans, the actual turning point, the principal beginning of the subjective possession of salvation. It is merely one of the treasures which the repentant person receives in addition to others, namely, that he may apply the satisfaction of Christ to himself" (*Comparative Presentation*, II, 5). "Yes, it is entirely Reformed thought that faith itself is conceived in the form of a command and, as a demand on the subject, is directed to the Mosaic Law, i. e., to the authority of the divine will. *Conf. Scoticana*, c. 14: "*unum habere Deum, Verbum eius audire, ei fidem dare, sanctis eius sacramentis communicare sunt primae tabulae opera*" (*I, 117*). Read in this connection

again the passage quoted above: "How salvation is attained through faith to the extent that it really practices good works," etc. Schneckenburger continues: "For the regenerate the Law itself is primarily a means of grace because it urges the exercise of works through which grace is always more completely assimilated by man and salvation is really won" (*Comparative Presentation*, I, 131). "Placing such a high value on works, partly as a necessary complement of faith, partly as the real cause for the enjoyment of salvation, partly as the objective demonstration of the power of Christ, approximates Catholic doctrine" (I, 160). Dr. Walther did not go too far when he wrote "that we are so often papists without a pope and, instead of seizing forgiveness freely through faith, want to earn it first with our repentance, we owe chiefly to the accursed doctrine of Zwingli and others (*Die luth. Lehre v. d. Rechtfertigung*, p. 85). Reformed theology is characterized by legalism.

Hence we may not retract our earlier statement that the Reformed article on contrition involves false doctrine. When the Reformed designate their repentance as saving grace, this is not an involuntary mistake, but it expresses the heart's conviction of the followers of Zwingli and Calvin that works effect salvation. Now it is also clear to us why Calvin in the passage "Repent for the kingdom of heaven is nigh," which proclaims the establishing of the kingdom of Christ, can think primarily of sanctification. "The one fundamental principle of Christianity, the very essence and the root idea of the 'kingdom of God,' is obedience to the will of God, joyful recognition of God's sovereignty." And [we also understand] that [Reformed] exegesis of Mark 1:15 criticized above ("Repent, and believe the Gospel!" — [their interpretation:] "The end is mentioned first and the means last") is not primarily an exegesis of despair but the only one that fits the Reformed understanding of the concepts. Now it is also clear why we stated above that the Reformed sentence: "Contrition follows faith" does not *in itself* harm the doctrine of justification. As the Reformed understand the word contrition the sentence *in itself* expresses the truth that holy contrition and sanctification in general follow faith. But in view of the significance which they ascribe to these things, this is a falsification — and this means finally a denial — of the

doctrine of justification — the doctrine that teaches that obedience toward God is not the center of Christianity but that the justification of the sinner is the highpoint in the Christian life and that faith, and faith alone, creates the certainty of salvation.

As a result of his legalistic tendencies the Reformed person employs the concept repentance in a wrong way. This concept is also employed in a wrong way when a Lutheran preacher preaches about repentance, about conversion, and, as a Lutheran preacher, begins with the absolute necessity of these for salvation and then operates with the Reformed definition of repentance. When an article appears in a Lutheran periodical about conversion, then we expect at the very outset that it discuss the work of God by which justifying faith is worked in the heart of the sinner. For in the Apology we read according to the Latin text: "Very closely related are the topics of the doctrine of repentance and the doctrine of justification"; and, "that is now the other, the most important part of repentance, namely, faith" (XII 57 29).

[Here a feature article of the *Lutheran* of September 4, 1930, is reprinted in condensed form and criticized.]

"Before the writings of Luther appeared, the doctrine of repentance was very much confused" (Ap. XII 4). The confusion soon started again among the Reformed. And if we are not extremely careful in our study of Reformed writings, the confusion will also penetrate our theology.

(To be concluded)



# Was Luther a Nominalist?<sup>1</sup>

By BENGT HAEGGLUND

THE problem of the relation between Luther and the tradition which derives its name from William of Occam<sup>2</sup> has in our time acquired a new interest. Certain Roman Catholic critics are inclined to ascribe the Reformer's heretical ideas to nominalist influences. According to them nominalism bears within itself a ferment of dissolution; it rejects in a radical manner the fundamental presuppositions of the whole scholastic theology. Is such a view based on an accurate representation of nominalism? This is a question which we cannot answer within the limits of the present article. Much can be said in favour of the contention; but it must not be forgotten that the theologians who may be regarded as Luther's masters were not in any marked degree innovators. In addition to William of Occam himself, there were Cardinal Pierre d'Ailly and above all Gabriel Biel, professor at Tübingen, whom his contemporaries regarded as a great theologian. They all kept rigorously within the framework fixed by the Church; though their school met with some opposition at the outset, it ended by becoming dominant in a whole chain of universities that were among the most influential of the period.

There are other reasons as well that make a study of the relations of Luther with occamism highly interesting. In spite of the extensive work that has been done on Luther's theology during recent decades, this particular topic has received hardly any attention. No doubt that is partly owing to practical difficulties in the way of all research into nominalist theology. There are hardly any recent editions of the works of the writers of this school, and their theological method makes it difficult to get a general grasp of their position. But it is worth while, even from a purely historical point

<sup>1</sup> This article was written originally by Bengt Häggglund for the French periodical *Positiones Luthériennes*, October 1955. It was translated into English by Dr. A. R. Vidler and appeared in the British magazine *Theology*, June 1956. To the author, the translator, and to both periodicals we are very grateful for their kind permission to make this significant article accessible to our readers. — W. R. Roehrs, Managing Editor, CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

<sup>2</sup> To designate this tradition we shall use the terms "occamism" and "nominalism" indifferently.

of view, to inquire into the connexions between Luther and the occamist tradition. Many of the Reformer's writings make use of nominalist terminology and are so closely bound up with the questions raised by this school that, in some cases, it is impossible to get hold of their meaning unless one is acquainted with their scholastic background.

The best way to approach the subject is to compare those of Luther's writings which depend on the nominalist tradition with the works of the authors to whom he refers. It is no good being content with generalities.

It is chiefly with respect to two matters that Luther's theology has been held to be in accord with that of the occamists; the doctrine of justification, on the one hand, and his conception of the relations between theology and philosophy, on the other. It is on these two questions that we shall concentrate our attention.

### I. THE DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION

Occamist theology presupposes a double definition of justification. According to the idea of the "regular power" (*potentia ordinata*) of God, justification consists in the gift of his grace that God bestows on the man who has known how to prepare himself for it aright. Grace in this case abolishes sin and sanctifies the man; we are then justified in consequence of a new (inner) condition that grace has created in us. According to the idea of the "absolute power" (*potentia absoluta*) of God, however, the nominalists also conceive of justification as the fact that God declares us righteous solely on the ground that he freely accepts us, without regard to what we bring with us in the way either of inherent grace or of holiness.<sup>3</sup> We may call this the doctrine of *acceptance*. Both these lines of thought must be taken into consideration when a comparison is made between nominalist theology and Luther's. We will first see what his attitude was to the usual occamist doctrine. Then we shall deal with the doctrine of acceptance.

From the very beginning of his polemic against nominalism, Luther takes his stand against the idea that there can be a prepara-

<sup>3</sup> Cp. the excellent discussion of this question by C. Feckes, "Die Rechtfertigungslehre des Gabriel Biel" (Münsterische Beiträge zur Theologie, fasc. 7), 1925.

tion of man for grace. This does not mean that he attacks the nominalist system just at one particular point. Rather it means that his conception of man and of grace is altogether different from that of the nominalists.

According to occamism, man who is deprived of grace can prepare himself in several ways to receive it. He can, for example, renounce sin and love God above all things. He can also produce a faith that prepares him for grace; he can accept the Christian message when he hears it. These various preparations are summed up in the idea that man ought "to do what is in his power" ("facere quod est in se" — which became a technical expression).

For Luther such a preparation is impossible on the level of human nature. "On the part of man," he says, "nothing precedes grace but an evil disposition, indeed nothing but rebellion against grace."<sup>4</sup> He explains this state of affairs on psychological as well as on theological grounds. In Luther's view the nominalist psychology is erroneous: it assumes that the will is capable of submitting itself to the imperatives of reason and of conforming itself to the truth once that is known — to the truth, for example, that God, being the supreme being, ought to be loved above all things.<sup>5</sup> In Luther's view man is incapable of controlling his interior will. No doubt his reason and his conscious will allow him to determine his outward acts, but he remains powerless in face of his internal impulses. They can be changed only by a stronger impulse, by a new will. We recognize here Luther's basic conception according to which unregenerate man is incapable of any good; he is the "old man," the corrupt tree that brings forth corrupt fruit. He cannot prepare himself to receive grace, because he is subject to the rule of sin. When he "does what is in his power," it bears the imprint of sin. All the good we are capable of comes from God. It is the Lord who works in us both to will and to do (Phil. 2:13). So Luther looks upon the idea that man, motivated by concupiscence and bound in sin, could love God above all things as absurd and blasphemous. Were it not so, man, who is but dust and ashes,

<sup>4</sup> "Ex parte autem hominis nihil nisi indispositio, immo, rebellio gratiam praecedat." *W. A.* 1, 225, 29.

<sup>5</sup> "Falsitas est quod voluntas possit se conformare dictamini recto naturaliter. Contra Sco. Gab." *W. A.* 1, 224, 15.

would have something of which to boast before God; then this being whose nature is corrupt could merit divine grace. But before God we are only sin and nothingness.<sup>6</sup>

What then is the truth about justification?

According to occamism, it takes place when God gives his grace to him who, on the natural level, "does what is in his power." Grace is instilled like a new quality which transforms the soul and raises its virtues to a supernatural level. The infusion of grace drives out sin and abolishes transgression. Justification is then the consequence at once of a condition of man and of a gift of God.

According to Luther, justification does not by any means spring from a new quality in regenerate man. Grace does not transform the soul nor does it exalt human nature. It is the divine mercy that brings about the forgiveness of sins. As the Spirit of God gives life, so grace confers that eternal life which is given us in and with the forgiveness of sins. We are not justified by reason of the new life which is in us, but by reason of the grace which is in God. This means that righteousness comes to us from God who imputes it to us by his grace. "Blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity" (Ps. 32:2).

Luther's teaching here presents an obvious contrast to the ordinary teaching of nominalism about justification. The fact that nominalism is marked by pelagian tendencies makes this contrast greater than that which exists in a general way between the Reformer's teaching and other areas of scholastic theology.

But when people speak of nominalist elements in Luther's theology they have something else in mind. It is in fact the other nominalist definition of justification that is considered to be the model from which Luther copied his doctrine of imputation. According to this second definition, man would be declared righteous only because God accepts him as such quite apart from any infusion of grace. We must therefore ask what Luther's attitude was with regard to this second occamist doctrine (the doctrine of acceptance). While rejecting the current doctrine, did not Luther

<sup>6</sup> "Veritas itaque est quod homo arbor mala factus non potest nisi malum velle et facere." *W. A.* 1, 224, 13. "Nisi quis ex spiritu renatus sit (sit quantopere coram se et hominibus iustus, castus, capiens), caro est, vetus homo est." 1, 146, 20. "Homo vetus, vanitas vanitatum universaque vanitas." 1, 145, 29.

adopt the theory of acceptance according to which God justifies man by his absolute power without respect to the grace that is instilled into him?

We have only to glance at Luther's criticisms of nominalism to be convinced that he did nothing of the kind. Luther not only rejects the pelagianism of his predecessors; he equally criticizes their theory of acceptance. According to him, a man's salvation can be due to nothing but the grace and the mercy of God. On the other hand, the idea that God could declare a man righteous in an entirely arbitrary manner is, in his eyes, only a meaningless formula, a bad joke. To admit that idea would be equivalent to denying the very nature of grace. For grace is not a quality inherent in man. It is the life-giving Spirit of God who really makes man righteous by the forgiveness of sins and gives life to those who are in a state of spiritual death.<sup>7</sup> It would follow from the idea of acceptance that God declares righteous a man who is only a natural man; a purely natural love for God would in that case appear to be the equivalent of supernatural love. This conception, so far from combating the pelagian tendency inherent in nominalism, would only reinforce it by accentuating its rationalism and by reducing the role of grace in the work of salvation. The nominalists do well to say that God declares the sinner righteous; but they deny the miraculous character of this justification.

For Luther, imputation is something other than the entirely arbitrary choice of an absolute power. This term describes an event big with consequences and essential in the divine order of salvation. Imputation is nothing else but the work of grace. And grace, instead of being the arbitrary will of God, works the justification of the sinner because of Jesus Christ. *Acceptance* means that God declares a sinner righteous because he is all-powerful; *imputation* means that God imputes to man the righteousness of Christ by faith. Imputation does not base salvation solely on the all-powerfulness of God; it bases it on the fulfilment of the law by Jesus Christ and on the infinite merits of the Saviour. To the

<sup>7</sup> "Non potest deus acceptare hominem sine gratia Dei iustificante. Contra Occam." *W. A.* 1, 227, 4. "Gratia dei nunquam sic coexistit ut otiosa. Sed est vivus, mobilis et operosus spiritus, nec per Dei absolutam potentiam fieri potest, ut actus amicitiae sit et gratia Dei praesens non sit. Contra Gab." 1, 227, 1.

arbitrary acceptance of nominalism the Reformation opposes its principle of "propter Christum."

For Luther, the whole point is that it is the sinner who is justified. The man of whom he speaks is not predisposed to salvation by any natural love for God. On the contrary, only the sinner can be justified. Only he who sees himself as God sees him—sinful, corrupt and wretched—can become before God what he would wish to be—righteous, good and pious. God's action operates in an opposite direction to man's. He lifts up the humble, justifies the sinner, gives life to the dead. That is why men are required to be humble and sincere and to see themselves as God sees them. Only then can God act as he intends, and give righteousness and life.<sup>8</sup>

The righteousness imputed to the sinner is by no means a declaration empty of real content. It is the very righteousness of God, a "strange righteousness" (*aliena iustitia*) of which we become partakers when God exchanges our guilt for the satisfaction wrought by Christ. There is a sense in which the nominalist idea of acceptance also means that it is the sinner who is justified. But then this justification takes place on the ground of man's natural virtue which the absolute power of God declares to be perfect and supernatural. Punishment is remitted without any satisfaction on man's part and the gift of virtue is conferred without infusion of grace. On the other hand, with Luther it is a real righteousness that becomes ours, although it is strange to us. By it alone we become righteous. It is imputed to us in virtue not of an arbitrary decision but of the faithfulness and mercy of God.

## II. THEOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY

Attempts have also sometimes been made to prove that Luther was nominalist in his views concerning the relations between theology and philosophy. The disparity that Luther sees between these two disciplines is taken to correspond to the line of demarcation which nominalism draws between natural knowledge and

<sup>8</sup> "Cum iustitia fidelium sit in Deo abscondita, peccatum vero eorum manifestum in seipsis, verum est, non nisi iustos damnari atque peccatores et meretrices salvari." *W. A.*, 1, 148, 35. "In conspectu meo semper sum peccator." 149, 1. "Stat firma sententia: Qui volet iustus fieri, peccator fiat necesse est." 5, 195, 41. Cp. 7, 546 f.

revelation. In both cases a new point of view will have taken the place of that harmony between faith and knowledge which was characteristic of classical scholasticism. The ultimate consequence of this conception is the theory of two kinds of truth.

But such an interpretation is too simple, and it fails to take account of the real situation. Certainly there are points of contact between Luther and the nominalists here as well as in regard to justification. There is, however, an essential theological difference between them which is of capital importance.

What distinguishes theology from philosophy according to occamism is the fact that the former has to do with revealed truths which cannot be completely proved, whereas philosophy is concerned with knowledge that can be demonstrated with certainty. To the question whether theology is entitled to be called a science, occamism gives a negative answer. Note, however, that this answer assumes a quite precise definition of what a science is. Only axiomatic principles and syllogisms that can be deduced from them are entitled to be termed science (*scientia*) in what was then regarded as the proper sense of the word. Because theology issues from different presuppositions, the information it yields is outside the field of philosophy or scientific knowledge.

At the same time, this clear line of demarcation between theology and science is only one aspect of the occamist theory of knowledge. Occamism also established very close links between the two spheres. Actually the scholastic method of presentation, which characterizes its theology, shows that in practice it hardly establishes an impassable barrier between faith and reason. It seeks, moreover, by considerations of principle to justify the rationalistic way of dealing with theological questions. It supposes that certain theological truths belong also to the sphere of philosophical knowledge; for example, the doctrines of the existence and nature of God. The elements of natural theology are thus within the scope of metaphysics. The fundamental conception that they have in common is that of being. But in this case what is the distinguishing character of theological truths properly so-called? Occam answers that, in so far as such truths are contingent, they cannot be known with certainty. To this class belong such propositions as "God creates" or "God has become man." On the other hand, theological truths

that are necessary, e. g., "God is Father, Son and Holy Spirit," can to some extent be the object of demonstrable knowledge. To be sure, there is no direct perception of them, which is normally the basis of this kind of knowledge. But perception is in this case replaced by a divine intervention: revelation, which is accepted by faith.

These examples show how occamism sought to forge links between theological and philosophical knowledge and to make room for theology in its general theory of knowledge. Not only are certain theological truths accessible to reason, but those that rest on a supernatural revelation can, after the event, become the object of rational speculation. Theological knowledge is, so to speak, on the same level as rational knowledge. The chief difference between them is that the former presupposes revelation and faith, faith being conceived as the submission of the will to the authority of revealed truth. As we have already said, nominalism holds that such a faith is possible on the natural level: man can produce it by his natural powers. Free will is then capable of adhering to truths of faith which ecclesiastical authority proposes to it.

Thus it is by starting from the theory of knowledge that occamism tries to solve the problem of the tension between faith and reason. Theological propositions cannot be demonstrated; some of them cannot be evidently known. They presuppose the submission of faith to authority. But, once these presuppositions are admitted, reason can take hold of them and deal with them according to its own laws. Therefore, although occamism clearly distinguishes between theology and scientific knowledge, it postulates an entire harmony between faith and reason. That is why it has no difficulty in practising scholastic speculation on the content of faith and even carrying it further.

Luther really followed the occamists in regard to theology and philosophy. He also takes the separation of these two spheres as his point of departure. For him as for his precursors the knowledge that faith gives is of a different kind from that which reason gives. It outreaches rational understanding (*supra rationis captum*), and above all it presupposes the existence and experience of faith.

But when Luther says that you can only understand the Gospel in temptation (*in der Situation der Anfechtung*), he is undoubtedly



taking his stand on other presuppositions than those of the nominalists, for whom knowledge through faith is of the same kind as practical knowledge and depends on acceptance by the will of a revealed truth. It is not, however, to be denied that there is a certain kinship in thought between Luther and the nominalists on this point. We meet in both the same conviction that theology has for its object truths which are, in the final analysis, impenetrable mysteries and that it is thereby distinguished from the profane sciences. Still, Luther's point of view is not that of the nominalist theologians. The best proof of this is that he broke radically with all the rational speculation in theological matters which marked the earlier tradition.

Luther sees in the tension between faith and reason something other than a problem connected with the theory of knowledge. For him this tension is primarily a theological problem. The knowledge that faith gives is altogether inaccessible to reason, not only because the natural intelligence is insufficient here, but chiefly because human reason is blinded by original sin and it lacks that spiritual light without which man is incapable of understanding revealed truths. Reason is not only man's natural way of thinking: this term also denotes man's perverted attitude to things divine. Reason bears the imprint of our carnal sentiments. Natural reason is therefore an obstacle to faith. If it cannot understand the Gospel, this is not only because of the supernatural character of faith-knowledge, but also because unregenerate man cannot rid himself of his perverted attitude. In everything he does he seeks his own interests. He tries to become righteous in the sight of God by good works which he produces. For a man to arrive at faith, his reason must first die and new light must be given him by the Holy Spirit. He cannot produce this faith himself. His free will cannot accept truths of faith. All is divine gift: not only the revelation as such, but also the faith that accepts the truth of revelation. "God has convicted the wisdom of the world of foolishness." All that belongs to man must be destroyed before God makes us partakers of the wisdom and spiritual knowledge that belong to faith.

These familiar notions are enough to show us that, for Luther, the relations between faith and reason are closely connected with the basic principles of his theology. This is the measure of the

distance that separated him, at this point, from occamism. For Luther this problem does not belong only to the sphere of the theory of knowledge. The difference between faith and reason must be studied on the basis of an anthropology stamped with the doctrine of original sin. For occamism reason is capable of understanding the content of revelation and making it an object of speculation. According to Luther, on the other hand, natural reason must be annihilated before we can understand "the things of the Spirit of God" (1 Cor. 2:14).

It should not be concluded that Luther denied all activity of reason in the sphere of faith. It is only necessary to recall the part reason plays in his famous words at Worms, according to which, if he was to be made to retract, he must be convinced by arguments drawn from the Scriptures or by indubitable reasons (*ratione evidente*). Plainly, Luther also refers to reason where there is a question of understanding the content of revelation and of formulating it theologically. But in this case it is the regenerate reason which submits without hesitation to divine revelation. There is no question of knowledge derived from natural reason being, so to speak, completed by revealed knowledge. Rather, faith itself becomes for the believer a new reason which Luther calls *ratio renata* or *ratio fidei*.

We find, then, in Luther two different points of view on the relations between reason and truths of faith. On the one hand he can say that faith combines with reason and makes use of it. On the other hand he presupposes that faith fights against reason, which must die and be annihilated in order that faith can arise within us. In the former case he means the natural function of reason as such; in the latter, the term "reason" denotes the perverted and carnal state of mind as also the compromise with the world, which are characteristic of the "old man."

Here is an example that will illustrate what we have said above, and also show, in conclusion, how this theology sets Luther in opposition to the nominalists.

In his "Disputation against Scholastic Theology" of 1517, Luther attacks, among other things, the idea of a "special logic of faith" (*logica fidei*), which was approved by the nominalists. Here is the text of his thesis on this subject: "It is in vain that one imagines

a logic of faith, a *suppositio mediata* beyond terms and number."<sup>9</sup> The addition, "against recent logicians," shows that he was criticizing conceptions that were current in nominalist circles. Some advocates of that system, in fact, thought that the rules of aristotelian logic could not apply to the doctrine of the Trinity without producing heretical conclusions. They applied the same principle to other dogmas as well — for example, to certain parts of Christology. We can see from several of Luther's disputations that he shared this point of view. Nominalism, however, proposed to provide a remedy for this incompatibility between logic and the Church's dogmas by substituting for the current logic another logic. Its rules would be broad enough to make it applicable to the sphere of faith. That is what was called the "logic of faith." This is the best possible example of the way in which the nominalist school separated theology and science. In rejecting the idea of a particular logic of faith, Luther shows that he is critical of the occamist tradition. The idea of a logic of faith assumes that the mysteries of faith can be enclosed within the rules of rational thinking. Even if truths of faith are outside the sphere of properly philosophical knowledge, they are, as it were, *a posteriori* subject to speculation and scientific discussion. Luther's criticism involves the outright rejection of traditional theological speculation. Further, if the thesis cited above is to be explained in harmony with the Reformer's fundamental conceptions, it must be said that he sees in the logic of faith a mixture of theology and science which he felt bound to condemn. Truths of faith ought to be explained in a manner different from profane knowledge. It is useless and vain to want to submit the mysteries of faith to the laws of reason. Faith must not be submitted to reason; that is why no rule of logic should be imposed on divine truth.

If the relation between occamism and Luther is considered only on the ground of the theory of knowledge, then there seems to be only a minimal difference between them, a nuance. But when the theological meaning and the practical consequences of this differ-

<sup>9</sup> "Frustra fingitur logica fidei, suppositio mediata extra terminum et numerum. Contra recentes dialecticos." *W. A.* 1, 226, 19. For the problems involved in this text, cp. Haeggglund, *Theologie und Philosophie bei Luther und in der occamistischen Tradition*. Lunds Universitets Arsskrift, vol. 51:4, Lund, 1955, pp. 43 ff.

ence are examined, it seems like a profound and pregnant transformation of all theological methodology and of Christian dogmatic theology.

Lund, Sweden

---

#### THE LAW IN THE LIGHT OF THE GOSPEL

Under this heading the *Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung* (February 1, 1957) offers a brief, but penetrating analysis of the Law and the Gospel, based on Röm. 7:7ff. In the passage quoted, Paul, as the writer says, uses the term νόμος as a synonym of ἐντολή: "commandment." The Law consists of the commandments which God revealed and gave to His people. In the light of the Gospel the Law appears as most intimately joined to the former. This intimate union shows itself in the fact that the Law cries out for the Gospel. In themselves the divine commandments are peculiarly powerless. They cannot awaken man to obedience or total dedication to God. The Law works death. Nor is this inability of the Law merely a deplorable *accidens*, but a part of the divine counsel of salvation. It is the weakness of the Law that it must cry out for the Gospel. But it is the strength of the Law that it renders this crying so necessary and urgent. In the service of the Gospel the Law enables man to recognize his sin in its most horrible manifestation. The Law drives sin out of its hiding. It judges my self-love and proves that in my whole existence, both in my supreme human heights and in my deepest inhuman depths, I am an irreconcilable enemy of God. But the Law is also so utterly weak that sin may use it to urge man to approach God as his partner on the ground of his own fulfillment of His commandments. Therefore man remains on the side of sin in all he does. The Law thus demonstrates most emphatically that it cannot be considered as a way to salvation.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

## *Outlines on the Ranke Epistles*

### THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

ACTS 3:9-26 (Read vv. 19, 20, 26)

The healing of the lame man in the name of Jesus. The coming together of the people and the same wonder and amazement that we find at the miracles of Jesus, but no faith. All the evidence was again there for them to behold, but evidently more was needed. Well might Peter have insisted that there never would be faith, especially in view of the many opportunities that these people had had and had rejected. But Peter was true to the purpose of God, which he knew so well from his own personal experience of forgiveness for all, even for a denier. So even to these who crucified (vv. 14, 15) he preached that in the Crucified there is forgiveness for all, for them.

At least two things must be noted throughout: (1) the fact that people are erring does not exclude them from the grace of God in Christ, and (2) the erring must be brought to the Word of God, which is nothing less than God's grace in Christ. These points are most admirably brought out by the text.

#### God Still Sends His Son to Bless You

##### *I. All sin is choice against Jesus, the Son of God (v. 14)*

- A. Sin is a refusal to glorify Jesus as God did (v. 13). This verse gives special emphasis to the fact that God, who sent Jesus, is the Covenant God and the God whom they have always claimed as their God. But He cannot be their God so long as they deny Jesus.
- B. Sin, the rejection of our true King, is always rebellion. V. 13 reminds us of the plea before Pilate: "We have no king but Caesar!" If God did not forgive sin, they would therewith have thrust themselves out of the kingdom of God.
- C. Sin is the denial of God's Holy and Just One (v. 14). It is revealed most dramatically in the choice of Barabbas over Jesus.
- D. Sin is the killing of the Prince of Life (v. 15) and therewith the destruction of our only hope of life.

NOTE: Sin must ever be seen before repentance is possible, but it can be seen in its true dimension only when it is seen as rejection of the love of God. This is especially true of error, because, in the very

nature of the case, the love of God, revealed by God, must be held and taught. Sin is the frustration of the purpose of God as expressed in the theme. Error denies that God sent His Son for the purpose stated.

II. *Ignorance, far from being an excuse, is the source of sin and as such is doubly condemned (v. 17)*

- A. The Jews to whom Peter was preaching had the mouth of the prophets (v. 18). Ignorance is the refusal to see Jesus in the light of what God says either by His prophets of the past or by His preachers of the present.
- B. They had Moses (v. 22). Moses was their boast, the foundation of their hope, and with this they condemned themselves because Moses condemns all that will not look away to the Prophet greater than himself, all who refuse to hearken to that Prophet. Thus they literally boasted of their condemnation.
- C. They are the children of Abraham (v. 25) and thus in the covenant. But they refuse to examine the covenant again and hold only to the name of Abraham. The terms of the covenant condemn them because they refuse to be blessed in Him in whom all the nations of the earth should be blessed.

NOTE: This shows the nature of error in particular. It is always failure and refusal to take God at His word; it is a renewal of the basic rebellion which rejects Christ as the Revelation of God, Jesus as the One in whom dwelleth the fullness of the Godhead bodily. This is the truth that is held out to those who err, and they err in that they do not acknowledge it as God's truth in Christ.

III. *But God still sends and pleads and blesses, but His sending is still the sending of the same Jesus and the pleading and the blessing are in Him alone*

- A. God Himself used sin to free us from sin (vv. 17, 18). This it is that robs sin of all power because its power has been exhausted in Christ. The very means by which the Jews rejected Jesus are the means by which He saves them if they now accept both the judgment and the grace implicit in this.
- B. God blots out sin (v. 19). This is the wonderful grace whereby Jesus, the Lamb of God, bore the sins of the world and bore them forever out of God's sight and memory. See your sins there in Christ, and your sin is remembered no more. Thus sin per se is no longer the basis of judgment; relationship to Christ is.

- C. He shall send as final Judge the very Jesus who was rejected (vv. 20, 21). This is comfort and threat. Error sees Him wrong who is final Judge and must be revealed as error in the light of the final Judgment. Faith is comforted in the fact that the Jesus who died for us is the Jesus who will judge.
- D. He raises us up in the power of the rejected Jesus' resurrection-life (v. 26), and this is the proclamation of Jesus' ultimate victory and therefore the victory of all them that are His.

NOTE: This section is the presentation of the grace of God in Christ Jesus, which sin and error reject. It is that sending of which the theme speaks. It is Jesus, the only Savior, offered as Savior again for those in sin and error. He is the only Savior and the full and perfect Savior of all who come to God by His name.

Minneapolis, Minn.

WILLIAM A. BUEGE

#### FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

ACTS 4:1-22 (Read v. 20)

The first Christians' eagerness to proclaim the Gospel and to win others into their fellowship was not dictated simply by obedience to a divine command; it sprang spontaneously out of an inward urge to share what they had discovered. They were new men in Christ, and the newness of life stirred them so powerfully that they had to try to pass it on. To be a real Christian in the early church was to be an ambassador. To fail here was to fail in being a fellow worker with Christ. When St. Paul reminded the Philippians that they were shining "as lights in the world, holding forth the Word of life," he was stating an accepted fact. The Church of Christ knew that through her alone shone out the light of the Gospel in a pagan world; through her total life alone could the Word of life be discovered.

God's witness can say, "I was there, I experienced, I know, thus saith the Lord, etc."

#### Witnessing Is Speaking Boldly What You Have Seen and Heard

##### I. *Bold witnessing makes enemies*

- A. The assertion that Christ died and lives is a "stumbling block" and "foolishness" to the unbeliever (1 Cor. 2:14).
- B. The text gives ample evidence of the opposition faced by Peter and John.
  - 1. Temple captains and Saducees were grieved (vv. 1, 2).

2. They put them in prison.
3. Rulers, elders, scribes, Annas, Caiaphas, John, and Alexander were called together to try Peter and John for their witness (vv. 5, 6).
4. The enemies question the power of bold testimony and miracles (v. 7).
5. Enemies can be expected to try everything possible to suppress the witness (vv. 17, 18, 21). They may employ the power of the sword, the power of government.
- C. We take courage from the fact that the power of enemies is limited. Ultimately and finally they will fail (vv. 16, 21). Even communism cannot stop the witness (v. 19). 20,000 communists are gaining on 600,000,000 Christians only where the witness is weak.

## II. *Bold witnessing makes disciples*

- A. God uses "foolishness of preaching" as His means of bringing salvation to men (2 Cor. 1:21).
- B. The simple positive statement of the truth from a convinced heart is God's method of adding to the church.
- C. In Jerusalem the number of believers grew quickly to 5,000 by this method (v. 4).
- D. The powerful Holy Spirit speaks through weak men.
  1. Peter was filled with the Holy Spirit (v. 8).
  2. The Spirit can use the unlearned and the ignorant (v. 13).
  3. The wisest of man cannot stop the operation of the Spirit (vv. 14-16).
  4. The Holy Spirit opens eyes and ears to make the witness bold (v. 20).
- E. Bold witnessing stands on the name of Jesus Christ.
  1. The work of redemption is its message.
  2. The apostle who denied His Lord on Maundy Thursday spent his life preaching "no other name" (vv. 11, 12).

## III. *Bold witnessing is needed today*

- A. Sins must be named (v. 10).
- B. The promises of the Gospel must be proclaimed.
- C. This is the work of laymen as well as pastors.
  1. Ministers are to train and equip laymen (Eph. 4:11, 12).



2. The PTR has right emphasis on lay witnessing (program and results of PTR can be cited).
- D. The number of witnesses (preachers) in every congregation can be increased from 1 to 500 (or whatever the membership is).
- E. The whole Book of Acts is a powerful example of lay and pastoral witnessing—the kind of bold witnessing we need. Half-hearted and shallow convictions did not produce apostolic witness with Pentecostal results. Be strong in the Lord!
- F. We are not to remain babes in Christ, Lilliputians of the Lord, tots of the truth.
- G. We must be Spirit-filled, staunch, stalwart men of God. We are messengers of peace, ambassadors for Christ, stewards of God's mysteries, fishers of men, voices in the wilderness of the 20th century, mouthpieces of the Most High!

Baltimore, Md.

G. H. SOMMERMEYER

#### FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

ACTS 4:23-31

Since church in existence, from Creation until now, mission work done, at times energetically. Salvation for all men, yet not all saved. Due to man's perversity. Number of unbelievers is constantly growing. More mission zeal and greater consecration required. But also assurance that cause good and victory certain.

#### The Church Wins Through to Victory

##### I. *When its task is understood*

- A. Our purpose: to win the world for Christ. But our task is to preach the Gospel by proclaiming Word and administering Sacraments. Holy Spirit uses these means to convert and win.
  1. The *Word* we preach. Bible, God's Book, but specifically the Christ of the Bible. Every text reveals in some way the Gospel message of sin and grace. Any other use of the Bible results in distortion, error, or worse, cheap moralizing. Even genealogies and table of nations must be so understood. Prophets and apostles always preached the Gospel from the Bible. So must we.
  2. The *preaching* of the Word. Not enough to print Bibles. While powerful, the Word must be understood. Hence the living voice. The Ethiopian and Philip (Acts 8:30,31).

Hence preachers, teachers, lecturers, radio, TV, house to house, mass meetings, PTR. The Great Commission. Also Sacraments, Tracts, Devotional Booklets, etc.

B. The Word must bear fruit. Healing. Signs. Wonders (v.30).

1. The Gospel always brings results: spiritually, mentally, physically. Civilization, culture, arts and sciences follow Gospel. Orphanages, homes for aged, hospitals, sanatoria, Christian doctors and nurses. Where Gospel repudiated, as in North Africa, poverty, disease, ignorance, brutality result. The conquered Evil One returns when the Conqueror is not wanted (Luke 11:21-26).
2. Faith healers and their ilk are not included here because of false doctrines. Are false prophets. Like Pharaoh's magicians, who could imitate Moses' works up to a point. Jesus' and apostles' miracles always instantaneous and complete and devoid of sensationalism. Faith healers cannot raise dead.

C. This the business of the church. Faith must work in love. The social implications of Gospel must be understood. But our business to preach Gospel. Providing fellowship, games, entertainment, physical facilities, as churches and schools, raising moneys, solving social problems, as race discrimination, are corollaries and must always be resolved with the motivation and the control supplied by the atonement. The preaching of the Word our great task, and through it the victory will be won. But only—

II. *When hindrances are taken into account and prepared for*

- A. Powerful forces are pitted against the Gospel. Herod, Pontius Pilate, Gentiles, kings of the earth, rulers. So today, too. Governments of China, Russia, Spain, Italy, etc. Christian goodness infuriates wicked heathen.
- B. Some of these from within the church. Sadducees, Pharisees, high priests, Sanhedrin. Today: Ecumenicity that ignores doctrines of Scripture. Church union dominated by modern and liberal thinking. Church unions built on compromise. Roman Catholicism, lodgery, etc.
- C. Indifference on the part of masses permitted hindrances and abetted them. A great hindrance itself. Materialism the great concern also today. Makes the church task most difficult. But this can be overcome, and the task can be completed.

III. *When every resource is tapped*

- A. God's governing omnipotence is exercised in behalf of His church (v.24). He is with us, too.
- B. Prayer of God's children (v.24) claims God's help, gives courage (vv.23,29,31). Prayer important for all endeavors in evangelism. For PTR, church services, adult classes, Bible classes, devotions, etc.
- C. Knowledge of God's Word (v.25). Knew Psalm 2. We ought to know Scripture too. Only by this means are we equipped to fight the Lord's battles. Eph. 16:11-17. Study Word.
- D. The Holy Spirit's Indwelling. V.31. Comes through Word and Sacrament. Indwells, convinces, strengthens, encourages, emboldens. Vitally necessary for Christian witnessing today.

Humanity's eternal welfare depends on church. Can we refuse to grasp the victory God has put into our hands, when so much depends on it? You too are needed. What if Peter or Paul had failed the Lord? What would history and geography show today? What will eternity reveal if you fail? Press on to assured victory by performing your task!

San Francisco, Calif.

ARTHUR C. NITZ

## SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

ACTS 4:32—5:11 (Read 4:32,33)

(Again the Ranke series achieves an interesting focus by lengthening the span of a text. Acts 5:1-11, always troublesome for the preacher because devoid of both goal and Gospel, recedes into the perspective of a powerful goal with both light and shadow.)

How shall a Christian take care of his money? "Give as much of it as you can toward the purposes of the church," say its leaders. "Don't have any money, live on other people," says one form of the monastic ideal. "It's a bad question," say many; "my Christianity is that part of my life which has nothing to do with my money—except my church contribution." Does anybody say: "The church should have some, give whatever looks right"? Our text describes how people under the first glow of Pentecost handled their money; some did well, some badly. From their experience we can learn:

Christian, Let the Grace of God Steer Your Giving of Money

I. *Christians have use for money*

- A. They need money for the care of their needy (v.34). They may be in their own families (1 Tim.5:8), or in the congregation at large, or in other places of the world (2 Cor.8).
- B. They need money for the provision of the Gospel to themselves and others (1 Tim.5:17; Gal.6:6).

## II. *Christians give this money in various ways*

- A. In the first church they "had all things common" (v.32) — the easiest way. Thus their poor were nourished (v.34), although they had to exercise care (Acts 6:1). We don't find this possible for *all* of our possessions.
- B. Other early Christians gave for the needy on a freewill basis (1 Cor.16:2; 2 Cor.8:2). This is the method of our churchly giving.

## III. *When Christians give money, let the grace of God steer it*

- A. It is of first importance that Christians give because they are prompted by the grace of God, i.e., God's redeeming work in Christ Jesus and the gift of the Holy Spirit (v.33).
- B. When people purporting to be Christians display their giving from source and motivation other than that of the Spirit, they lie to the Holy Ghost (5:3,9). The early church received special help in its discipline to thwart such giving (5:1-11). But it is just as important for the church today to forestall this procedure.
- C. The church preaches the power of the resurrection (4:33). The whole church must reinforce this witness through the demonstration of the Spirit and of power in the lives, including the giving, of Christians (4:33-37; cf. 2 Cor.8:3-5).
- D. To that end the members of the church need to strengthen the grace of God in their own hearts through their mutual witness (cf. Acts 2:42-47; 4:31,32).

How shall we take care of our money? Turn it over to each other for disbursement? That would be one way; we do so with a substantial portion of our money, and we call it the "budget." But it is of first importance that we turn over *all* of our money—also that for food and fun and taxes and shelter—to God, because of the living God in our hearts. Otherwise we run the risk of lying to the Holy Ghost. Let us rather be witnesses of Christ's resurrection!

St. Louis, Mo.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

## THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER

### THE LWF AND THE CHURCHES IN AUSTRALIA

The *Australian Lutheran*, October 31, 1956, reports the action taken by the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Australia (in fellowship with The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod) with regard to the question of the Lutheran World Federation. In protracted negotiations with the United Evangelical Lutheran Church of Australia the joint committees of both churches have given serious attention to the problem of membership in the LWF (cf. the report in this journal, November 1956, pp. 891ff.). The article gives the results of these discussions by quoting and referring to the minutes of these joint meetings. It then adds the changes in the constitution of the LWF which the ELCA suggests as well as the alterations suggested by the UELCA. We quote the article from this point to the end:

#### SUGGESTED ALTERATIONS TO LWF CONSTITUTION

##### I. *Name of Federation*

To be retained as at present.

##### II. *Doctrinal Basis*

To be deleted.

##### III. *Nature of Federation*

"The LWF shall be a free association of Lutheran Churches. It shall have no power to legislate for the Churches belonging to it or to interfere with their complete autonomy, but shall act as their agent in such matters as they assign to it within the scope of this Constitution." Mts. 28/7/55; Mts. 2/9/55.

*Purpose:* "The purposes of the LWF are:

- "(A) To promote mutual understanding and to cultivate unity of faith and confession among the Lutheran Churches of the world with the aim of reaching a degree of unity of faith and confession, which justifies the establishing of church fellowship between the member churches;
- "(B) To promote co-operation in study among the Lutherans;
- "(C) To bear witness before the world to the truth of God's Word as confessed and taught in the Lutheran Confessions on the basis and within the scope of such unity as exists between the member churches;

- "(D) To supply material aid to all men in need, especially to Lutherans;
- "(E) To arrange for spiritual aid, to be given in keeping with Scriptural and confessional principles, especially to Lutheran groups in need. Mts. 2/9/55.
- "(F) To foster a common Lutheran attitude and action regarding missions and education on the basis of sound Lutheran principles. Mts. 13/10/55.
- "(G) To study the relationship of Lutheran Churches to non-Lutheran churches and organizations and ecumenical movements, to seek to define the proper Lutheran attitude, and to encourage member-churches to act accordingly." Mts. 17/11/55.

#### IV. *Membership*

"All autonomous Lutheran Churches are eligible for membership, whose constitution acknowledges the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the only sound and infallible norm of all Christian doctrine and practice and the Confessions of the Lutheran Church, or at least the Unaltered Augsburg Confession and Luther's Small Catechism, as the pure exposition of the Word of God, and who declare their adherence to this Constitution.

"No church shall be eligible for membership which is incorporated in a non-Lutheran Church. Mts. 2/9/55.

"Acceptance into membership shall be decided by the LWF in Assembly by not less than a two-thirds majority. Any application for membership between meetings of the Assembly shall be considered by the Executive Committee: if the application is supported by a two-thirds majority of the members of the Executive Committee present and voting, this action shall be communicated to the churches that are members of the LWF and, if approval is received from no less than two-thirds of the member churches within six months, the applicant shall be declared elected." Mts. 17/11/55.

Rest of constitution remains.

---

The Joint Committee on October 13, 1955, through its president general, requested the UELCA to submit these proposed alterations to the Executive of the LWF at its meeting in Madras in January 1956. This was done by Dr. Lohe. The proposals were not discussed by the Executive but referred to its constitutional committee. The last general

convention of the UELCA at Walla resolved to suggest the following alterations:

- (1) That the Lutheran World Federation consider whether the present "doctrinal basis" clause does not endanger the federation character of the Lutheran World Federation. It is suggested that the principles expressed in this paragraph be so worded that they apply to the member churches, both as a clause of eligibility for membership and as a clause defining the confessional responsibility of the member churches in their activities within the Federation.
- (2) That if point (1) is acceptable, the constitution of the Lutheran World Federation also embody a clause to safeguard the confessional character of the operations of the Federation as such.
- (3) That provision be made in the constitution of the Lutheran World Federation for procedure in informing member churches of applications for membership in the Federation, whereby the opportunity is offered for member churches to raise fundamental objections.
- (4) That the Lutheran World Federation consider the re-wording of Clause III 2 (a) of the constitution in order to avoid the ambiguity of the phrase "united witness," and of the Clause III 2 (b) in order to avoid the ambiguity of the phrase "foster participation."

The convention also decided to forward these to the executive of the LWF with explanatory notes in a covering letter.

Both churches have agreed to await the action of the LWF on these proposals at its next assembly in Minneapolis in 1957.

On behalf of the intersynodical committees,

W. R. R.

S. P. Hebart    F. J. H. Blaess

#### WHY A WORLD CONCLAVE OF LUTHERANS?

[ED. NOTE: The following article was written by Dr. E. Clifford Nelson and appeared in the *News Bureau* of the National Lutheran Council.]

"Just what do you expect to achieve by this convention?" is what one man asked at a preliminary discussion of the 1957 Assembly. Indeed, why meet in Minneapolis or any other place as a conclave of world Lutherans? This question cannot be answered without a preliminary review and interpretation of past Assemblies.

*Needs Met by First Assembly*

No Christian communion was so deeply and critically wounded by World War II and its immediate consequences as was the church of the Augsburg Confession. The stench and weariness of total war and the shadow of another liberty-denying power hung over the First Assembly of the Lutheran World Federation held at Lund, Sweden, in the summer of 1947.

The emaciated delegates from Germany and the prophetic voice of Bishop Ordass, of Hungary, were stark reminders of the post-war character of the Lund Assembly. It faced two directions: toward the past to repair the wounds in the Body of Christ; toward the future to evaluate the possibility of a united Lutheran testimony in a dividing world.

At this First Assembly Lutheran representatives from the victorious countries, such as the U.S. A. and Canada, met together with men and women from neutral Sweden, vanquished Germany, occupied Norway and Denmark. Moreover, delegates from churches-in-exile of Russian-conquered Baltic countries, from Communist-dominated Poland and Hungary reminded all that the Lutheran Church was living in tension. The theme of this assembly was "The Lutheran Church in the World Today."

It was at Lund that the old Lutheran World Convention, organized at Eisenach, Germany, was reorganized as the Lutheran World Federation, with constitutionally stated purposes:

1. to bear united witness before the world to the Gospel of Jesus Christ as the power of God for salvation;
2. to cultivate unity and faith and confession among Lutheran churches;
3. to promote fellowship and cooperation in study among Lutherans;
4. to foster Lutheran participation in ecumenical movements;
5. to develop a united Lutheran approach to responsibilities in missions and education;
6. to support Lutheran groups in need of spiritual and material aid.

Most immediate of these stated purposes was the last, for already a flow of money and goods was being channeled through Geneva from the "haves" to the "have nots." War-orphaned missions were assisted with personnel, money, and materials. Churches grew out of the rubble. Service to refugees—millions of them—expressed the Savior's compassion. Lund set in motion and implemented a massive demonstration of unity in faith and love.



*Accomplishments of Second Assembly*

In 1952, Hannover, Germany, was the site of the Second Assembly of the LWF. Delegates discussed Lutheran cooperation under the general theme, "The Living Word in a Responsible Church." The cordial hospitality of the German churches, the enthusiasm of overseas delegations, the large number of visitors, especially from America, and the vitality of the youth representatives were all indications that the Federation had won an abiding place in the affections of world Lutherans. To echo a voice heard at another world congress, the sentiment seemed to be, "We intend to stay together."

Recognizing this testimony of unity, the Hannover Assembly assessed the Federation's structure and re-shaped it along what promised to be permanent lines of action in the future. Thus LWF work in various fields was consolidated under four permanent departments and one permanent committee: Theology, World Missions, World Service, Information, and Latin America.

*Task of Minneapolis Assembly*

Minneapolis was chosen host city for the August 15—25, 1957, LWF Assembly meetings. This meeting of world Lutherans will best be anticipated by studying the experiences of Lund and Hannover, and by reflecting on the fact of the Federation's maturing program. In the first place, the time is now at hand to discuss the life of the churches in relation to the constitution's aims and purposes as expressed especially in items 2, 3 and 4. These three, properly understood, are implementations of item 1 ("to bear united witness before the world to the Gospel of Jesus Christ as the power of God for salvation").

In the second place, it is incumbent upon this Assembly to ask and seek to answer what this Assembly can mean (1) to the churches of free Europe, (2) to the churches in Kremlin-dominated countries, and (3) to American Lutheran churches seeking to find each other in merger movements.

The above problems, it seems, have already been summarized under the chosen theme, "Christ Frees and Unites." The Committee felt that the theme must touch the actual problems of world Lutheranism today: the unity of the church and church fellowship as consequent to Christian freedom through justification. Or, in other words, it must proclaim that the liberating "act of God in Christ is . . . an act that unites and also an act of deliverance from dividing disunity."

The goal and purpose, then, of the Minneapolis Assembly will be to guide the biblical-theological discussion to the natural consequences

of the theme; to face the questions of church fellowship and service by the church in the world. Difficult and embarrassing questions dare not be avoided or ambiguously answered. The implications of Christian fellowship, which reach out and involve not only fellow Lutherans but also other Christians in the ecumene, must be made apparent to the churches in the Lutheran family. But Christian freedom not only unites the churches in theory, it binds them in loving service. At this point the Minneapolis Assembly must ask itself, "How can the responsibility of the individual Christian, as well as the whole Church, be awakened to service, not only in the local congregation, but in the world?"

This, it seems, is the answer to the gentleman who asked, "Why this Assembly?"

#### BRIEF ITEMS FROM "RELIGIOUS NEWS SERVICE"

*Chicago.* — Representatives of four Lutheran church bodies discussing a merger met here and received a preliminary document which, they agreed, would serve as the basis for writing the doctrinal statement in the constitution of the proposed new church. The representatives constitute a Joint Commission on Lutheran Unity. The statement, entitled "The Word of God and the Confessions," was presented by Dr. Karl E. Mattson, president of the Augustana Lutheran Theological Seminary at Rock Island, Ill.

Involved in the merger scheme are the 2,270,000-member United Lutheran Church in America; the 536,000-member Augustana Lutheran Church; the 35,000-member Finnish Evangelical Lutheran Church of America (Suomi Synod); and the 20,000-member American Evangelical Lutheran Church.

The joint commission approved preliminary drafts of statements on the ministry, on seminaries and colleges. Responsibility in these areas will be centered in the constituent units, with shared authority granted to the central church body. Also approved by the commission was the creation of a subcommittee of four members to meet with representatives of the foreign mission boards of the four churches involved to draft a plan for a new board in the merged church. A similar committee was authorized to come up with a proposal for a new board of American (or home) missions. Other committees were authorized to study the number and duties of officers of the new church as well as its interim executive body and of a judiciary.

The commission heard preliminary reports on an organizational pattern for the new church, and proposals for geographical boundaries

of its constituent units—to be known as conferences, districts, or synods.

It deferred until September a reply to the Joint Union Committee of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, the American Lutheran Church, and the United Evangelical Lutheran Church, which had proposed a conference with the Joint Commission on Lutheran Unity to "discuss the bases and possible plans for closer co-operation between all Lutheran bodies in America."

Presiding at a meeting here was the commission's chairman, Dr. Malvin H. Lundeen of La Grange, Ill., vice-president of the Augustana Lutheran Church. Present also as commissioners were the presidents of the four bodies seeking organic union: Dr. Franklin Clark Fry, New York, United Lutheran Church; Dr. Oscar Benson, Minneapolis, Augustana Lutheran Church; Dr. Alfred Jensen, Des Moines, Iowa, American Evangelical Lutheran Church; and Dr. Raymond W. Wargelin, Hancock, Mich., Finnish Evangelical Lutheran Church of America.

*Frankfurt am Main, Germany.*—Pastor Martin Niemoeller has become involved with some German Lutheran leaders in a controversy over demands for "clear minority" rights for Lutherans in non-Lutheran churches in the Evangelical Church in Germany (EKID). He has opposed such demands. Dr. Niemoeller is president of the Evangelical Church of Hessen and Nassau, which belongs to the Evangelical Union (formerly the Old Prussian Union) Church. The EKID is a federation made up of Lutheran, Reformed, and United Churches.

The controversy was stirred by a resolution adopted at a recent meeting in West Berlin of the management of the United Evangelical Lutheran Church in Germany (VELKD) demanding the minority rights. The VELKD leaders warned that otherwise the formation of further "free" Lutheran parishes would be unavoidable.

Pastor Niemoeller criticized the VELKD position as a threat to the unity of the EKID, which, he said, is now going "to face the test of its coherence and solidarity." He reported in this connection that a leading representative of VELKD had participated in the recent dedication of a "free" Lutheran church in Kaiserslautern. And he charged this was contrary to an established policy of all EKID member churches not to support "free" parishes in the areas of other regional Evangelical churches.

The EKID must break apart, Pastor Niemoeller contended, if the VELKD seeks to divert it from this principle of solidarity.

*Accra, Ghana.*—Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, prime minister of the new state of Ghana, told a news conference here he will continue to welcome Christian missionaries into the country. "We owe a lot to missionaries," he said, adding that his people have become Western in their outlook and have no intention of joining the Afro-Asian bloc of Communist countries. Most members of Ghana's cabinet are products of mission schools, and 80 per cent of the children in these schools today are registered as Christians.

The Rev. Christian G. Baeta, chairman of the Christian Council of Ghana, also paid tribute to the missionaries. "Particularly would we remember with humble thanksgiving," he told the *African Challenge*, leading Protestant newspaper in West Africa, "the noble army of missionaries of the Gospel who, in selfless devotion, penetrated the deepest recesses of our land and of the lives of its people, bringing in the light of God, the light by which we now live."

Dr. Baeta, who is senior lecturer in theology at the University College in Ghana, stressed, however, the need to improve Christian instruction in the new nation. "The ordinary religious instruction given is very primitive," he said. "We teach young people basic Bible stories, but little instruction is given on how to carry Christianity into practical life. Only the Christians can give the moral instruction so vital to a young nation, and they must do this through literature."

## BOOK REVIEW

*All books reviewed in his periodical may be procured from or through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 South Jefferson Avenue, St. Louis 18, Missouri.*

**DIE ÜBERWINDUNG DER ANFECHTUNG BEI LUTHER.** By Horst Beintker. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1954. 204 pages. Paper. Ostmark 8, 00.

This elaboration of a dissertation presented to the theological faculty of the University of Greifswald examines a question of central significance to Luther's theology, the problem of overcoming temptation, spiritual assault, or soul struggle. Luther's second lectures on the Psalms are of special importance, for they were prepared during years of severe personal and spiritual trials for the Reformer. In contrast to various contemporary psychological explanations of the soul struggle in man, the author emphasizes its uniquely theological rather than anthropological nature. More than personality deficiency, inner tension, or a generalized pervasive feeling of anxiety, the soul struggle was for Luther an identifiable spiritual problem of a specific kind. Both as a condition and a special attack (*tribulatio et tentatio*), it was basically a result of man's estrangement from God. The ultimate originator of the struggle, viewed on the deepest level, is God, who through His Word reveals *caro*, the flesh, as it is, precipitating the struggle. This function of the Word is Law, and the *Anfechtung* is a part of God's judgment on man. Faith in Christ and the forgiveness of sins is the cure. Particularly intriguing is the author's explanation of Luther's mystifying references to the disappearance of Christ in temptation and the utility of the First Commandment in restoring His image. The final part of the monograph deals with the meaning of *simul iustus et peccator* for the relationship of temptation and certainty. In addition to an initial comprehensive survey of the extensive literature on this problem, the author throughout the volume carries on a constant critical conversation with other scholars which is of great interest to the careful student of Luther's theology, though likely to be disconcerting to that less hardy creature, the gentle general reader.

L. W. SPITZ, JR.

**MAN IN THE PROCESS OF TIME: A CHRISTIAN ASSESSMENT OF THE POWERS AND FUNCTION OF HUMAN PERSONALITY.**

By J. Stafford Wright. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1956. 187 pages. \$3.00.

In this unique book a very conservative Biblical scholar who is also competent in the fields and literature of psychology, parapsychology, spiritualism, and occultism has undertaken to analyze and correlate the evi-

dence with the Biblical doctrine of man. The author is principal of Tyndale Hall, Bristol, England. His book was first published by the Paternoster Press, London, in 1955, under the title *What Is Man?*

Convinced that "all truth is God's truth, and all must ultimately be one" (p. 12), Professor Wright sympathetically but sanely reviews the current psychical research into the extrasensory perceptions (ESP) of the body-mind relationship and the intriguing realm of telepathy, clairvoyance, and precognition, what parapsychology calls the psi faculties. Also included are discussions of spiritualism, occultism, ghosts and poltergeists, miracles, and angels. Professor Wright is convinced that man's mind apparently transcends time and space. In Biblical terms this may mean that man's spirit (*neshamah*, *pneuma*) participates impersonally in the Divine Life-Force in the world. Again and again, however, the author protests against any identification between this impersonal penetration and the Christian doctrine of the indwelling Spirit. While personal being, the "soul," survives death according to the Scriptures, and this may be linked to a surviving mind, reincarnation is utterly rejected on both evidential and Scriptural grounds.

The chapter on miracles was particularly suggestive to this reviewer. If mind can affect matter, then the older definition of miracles as suspensions of natural laws is inadequate. Professor Wright holds that although Christ's miracles all demonstrated that He was the promised Messiah, they were not necessarily all performed by virtue of His deity. Although Wright's hypothesis still may harbor the Calvinistic tendency toward false separations of the two natures, Lutheran theology, with its commitment to the *unio personalis*, ought to be able to utilize this revised estimate of man, mind, nature, and miracle.

Outstanding are Professor Wright's bibliographic data, even though they are largely limited to the British Isles. Exegetes interested in Gen. 6:4 will find Professor Wright on the side of the early church fathers. The Biblical and theological chapters at the end are sketchy but scholarly. Although the Christocentric conclusions are admirable, the author indicates his Calvinistic-Fundamentalist convictions. Thus Baptism is not only separated from the Holy Spirit but from the other "means of grace," (under which he includes prayer). Wright would have the Scriptures included under "means of grace," but holds that they are such largely as "the manual of Christian instruction" (p. 164) and that the distinction between revelation and inspiration becomes "merely academic" (p. 172).

HENRY W. REIMANN

*THE CHURCH AND THE JEWISH PEOPLE*, ed. Göte Hedenquist.  
London. Edinburgh House Press, 1954. 212 pages. Cloth. 10/6.

An international panel of outstanding Christian and Jewish scholars—three Anglicans, three Presbyterians, three European Lutherans (Hedenquist himself, Gösta Lindeskog, and Karl Heinrich Rengstorff), a Metho-

dist, and two Jews—have here produced one of the sanest and most informative discussions of "the Jewish question" to have appeared in recent years. In this introduction Stephen Neill reminds us that our duty to the Jews has not been "fulfilled by the exercise of tolerance and fairmindedness" (p. 24). In his provocative theological essay, "The Jewish Problem and the Church's Understanding of Its Own Mission," Rengstorff argues that "it may well be that the question whether the promises given to Israel are actually fulfilled in Jesus Christ will be decided for the Jews if they can recognize in the Church, which claims to be the Body of Christ, the traits of the Messiah of the chosen people of God, Israel" (p. 45). Lindeskog furnishes a perceptive "Evaluation of the Theological Situation of the Jewish People Today and of Contemporary Trends in Judaism." Other essays discuss "Faith and the Jewish Law Today," "The Emergence of the State of Israel and its Significance for the Christian Church," "State and Religion in the State of Israel," "Some Questions to the Christian Church from the Jewish Point of View" by the quondam Chief Rabbi of Berlin, "Co-operation Between Christians and Jews," "The Church and the Hebrew Christian," specific responsibility of Christians to their Jewish contemporaries at the level both of the church at large and the parish church, and "The Christian Message to Israel." Appendices reproduce the WCC 1948 Amsterdam Assembly "Report on the Christian Approach to the Jews" and summarize the nation-by-nation distribution of the world's Jewish population as of 1952 (11,600,000, fewer than two thirds of the pre-war 18,000,000 Jews). The American reader, for whom "the Jewish question" has acquired a specifically American formulation, will find it enlightening to try to consider it against the ecumenical backdrop this symposium provides.

ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN

*THE AMERICAN ADAM: INNOCENCE, TRAGEDY, AND TRADITION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY*, ed. R. W. B. Lewis. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, c. 1955. 204 pages. Cloth. \$5.50.

A Rutgers University scholar here brilliantly furthers the study of American intellectual history in the tradition of F. O. Matthiessen's *American Renaissance*. From the literature of 1820 to 1860 he presents the convincing thesis that there was a native American mythology. The authentic American was set forth "as a figure of heroic innocence and vast potentialities, poised at the start of a new history." This "image crowded with illusions" made possible the persistent dialog between the Party of Hope and that of Memory, with a Party of Irony stressing the doubleness of man's real nature and situation.

Each chapter moves the dialog forward: Walt Whitman and Horace Bushnell; James Fenimore Cooper and Nathaniel Hawthorne; Herman Melville, greatest novelist of the nineteenth century, presenting in Captain Ahab "Adam gone mad with delusion" and yet in Billy Budd

transcendent cheerfulness through "sacrifice"; Bancroft versus Parkman. As theological examples of the dialog we have ultraradical Theodore Parker with his doctrine of intuition and inspiration and Rome-bound Orestes Brownson in search of communion. Many other literary figures crowd their way into this packed volume.

This is far from mere literary historicizing. In this Adamic dialog the author not only employs terms that are sparkingly contemporary (innocence, experience, time, evil, hope, tradition), but he is also very conscious of twentieth-century skepticism that opposes not merely any party of hope but any dialog at all. A pastor who is alive to the need of understanding the contemporary man to whom he brings the Gospel will profitably read and study this book. In particular, Lewis will help reveal to him America's Calvinistic roots.

HENRY W. REIMANN

*SCIENCE, DEMOCRACY AND ISLAM, AND OTHER ESSAYS.* By Humayun Kabir. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1955. 126 pages. Cloth. \$3.00.

A voice from the East, such as this, reminds us that run-of-the-mine Western culture and scholarship are often still provincial. We are ready to concede that the world is no longer flat; but we make it flat on one side by slicing off, in our teaching of history, literature, philosophy, and other subjects, one portion of the globe.

Kabir is educational adviser to the Government of India, chairman of the executive board of the Indian National Commission for UNESCO, president of the Indian Philosophical Congress, and co-editor of the government-sponsored *History of Philosophy: Eastern and Western*.

Of the eight essays in this volume, three, "The Concept of Democracy," "The Rights of Man," and "East and the Problems of Education," were first published by UNESCO.

In the somewhat propagandistic (and syncretistic) title essay, Kabir makes the point that both science, which emphasizes the individual instance, and democracy, which safeguards the rights of the individual, require a unitary world. Islam provided the philosophical framework for this concept by emphasizing the unity of God.

"The Concept of Democracy" is an interesting attempt to find a common denominator between what are, virtually, the Russian and American concepts of this term, though no labels are used. Kabir seeks it in a correlation between rights and duties.

To understand the essay, "The Rights of Man," one must recall the actual conditions in India, where, for instance, in Calcutta, a city about the size of Chicago, one million people, including many families with children, cook and sleep on the streets because they have no other shelter. Hence under human "rights" he includes food and clothing, housing, education, and medical services. He recognizes fully that "the crux of the problem is, however, to determine (a) what constitutes the minimum and (b) the



degree of state control and interference necessary to secure these basic standards" (p. 40).

In "The Welfare State," he declares, "democracy owes its rise to various factors. Of these the religious element of the value of the soul is one of the most important" (p. 56).

In "Reflections on Indian Thought and Practice" the reader will appreciate Kabir's definition of *satyagraha*, often described as passive resistance, but actually nonviolent opposition to evil.

Politically, Kabir is a personification of the Indian viewpoint of a "third force" independent of both great world powers. W. J. DANKER

*A REPORT ON THE AMERICAN JESUITS.* Text by John La Farge; photographs by Margaret Bourke-White. New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, 1956. 237 pages. Cloth. \$4.50.

*SAINT IGNATIUS AND THE JESUITS.* By Theodore Maynard. New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons, 1956. viii and 213 pages. Cloth. \$3.00.

As a product of the bookmaker's art the volume printed by Farrar, Straus, and Cudahy is outstanding. The photographs by Miss Bourke-White, originally made on an assignment by *Life*, are superb. La Farge writes in an arresting style. He treats of the origins of the Jesuits and then tells about the Jesuits in the United States. The chapter on the training of the Jesuits is clear and informative; so is the chapter on "The Theory of Jesuit Education." Other chapters deal with the Jesuit brother, the Jesuit apostleship, Jesuit activities, and American Jesuit missions. La Farge's sympathetic, appealing account gives an excellent introduction to the order.

Theodore Maynard, too, is a well-known writer, a Roman Catholic. His book is more detailed than is La Farge's work. Maynard does not avoid all of the problems connected with the history of the Jesuits; those which he chooses to write about, however, are solved in favor of the Jesuits. The chapter dealing with the suppression of the Jesuits is an extremely helpful summary. A bibliography adds to the value of this work.

It may not be out of order to cite a few of Maynard's judgments to show the tenor of his work. "The Jesuit politician is almost a complete myth" (p. 92). At the Wartburg Luther "had thrown his inkwell at the Devil, which confirms what is believed of his neurotic temperament" (p. 25). This Luther, he admits, "was after all a man of genius" (p. 105). In Loyola, he says, "there was being providentially prepared the instruments the age needed" (p. 25). Maynard, too, might be criticized for some of the points he omitted. What role did the Jesuits play in Poland or Bohemia, for instance?

These two volumes attest to the vitality of the Society of Jesus. Even though they are written from the Roman Catholic point of view, possibly because of that, they deserve careful reading. CARL S. MEYER

**THE MOMENT BEFORE GOD.** By Martin J. Heineken. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1956. 386 pages. Cloth. \$5.95.

It may seem a far cry from the Dane Søren Kierkegaard to the Norwegian Henrik Ibsen — the one a philosopher and theologian, the other a poet and dramatist — but there are striking similarities. Ibsen struck at the social evils of his day in a smug "compact majority," Kierkegaard at the ecclesiastical evils of a complacent church. In the Scandinavian countries society and church were supposedly identical. Both writers emphasized the importance of the individual. While both had to bide their time for international acclaim, both eventually attained merited recognition.

Heineken's book is another serious tribute to the esteem accorded to that remarkable man, Søren Kierkegaard. Dr. Heineken portrays him as a Christian rather than as a mere social reformer like Ibsen. Kierkegaard's theology is more important to him than his philosophy. He presents him as a man who took his Christianity seriously. Granted that Kierkegaard did so, he does not appear as a faithful exponent of Biblical Lutheranism. Luther would have paid a greater tribute to the inerrancy of Scripture and to the power of the means of grace — the Gospel and the Sacraments.

L. W. SPITZ

**A NEW CREATION: TOWARD A THEOLOGY OF THE CHRISTIAN LIFE** (*Eine neue Schöpfung: ein Beitrag zur Theologie des christlichen Lebens*). By August Brunner, translated by Ruth Mary Bethell. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956. 143 pages. Cloth. \$4.75.

This five-year-old work, by a distinguished German Jesuit and religious journalist, is a notable contribution to the increasing literature by which a not inconsiderable group within the Roman Catholic Church is attempting the very difficult task of redefining theologically the relation between monastic and lay Christianity. A basic essay on "The Meaning of the Christian Life" is followed by three further sections analyzing the three monastic vows and their relation to the common life in Christ: "Possessions and Poverty," "Marriage and Chastity," and "Freedom and Obedience."

ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN

**THIRTY YEARS A WATCH TOWER SLAVE.** By W. J. Schnell. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1956. 207 pages. Cloth. \$2.95.

The chief value of this book for this reviewer lies in the insight which it affords into the organization, purposes, procedure of the religious group known as Jehovah's Witnesses. From the time he was 16 years old until he was nearing 50, W. J. Schnell was actively engaged in promoting the Watch Tower cause in Europe as well as in America. In 22 chapters the author describes what he regards the devious methods, mercenary motives, and autocratic rule of the organization in which he held membership

for three decades. Some will find in this book the obvious strength of personal experience; others will see the weaknesses which they frequently associate with what they regard as an exposé. LORENZ WUNDERLICH

*CALVIN'S DOCTRINE OF THE WORK OF CHRIST.* By John Frederick Jansen. London: James Clarke and Co., 1956. 120 pages. Cloth. 8/6.

This interesting investigation in the area of Christology grows out of two chief considerations. Thereby the author intends to offer the Christian Church an added reminder of her heritage from the Reformation. He is also of the opinion that the current Luther renaissance solicits a corresponding Calvin renaissance. The return of contemporary theologians, notably Emil Brunner, to the familiar category of Christ as Prophet, Priest, and King, prompts the author to investigate the origin of this triad. He comes to the conclusion that Calvin the dogmatician is responsible for popularizing it, though Calvin the exegete made little use of it. This paradox Jansen resolves by the statement: "The Messianic work of redemption remains for Calvin a regal and reconciling work of King and Priest" (p. 97). It may serve a purpose to state that as early as 1523 Martin Luther elaborates on the concept of Christ as Prophet.

LORENZ WUNDERLICH

*IMMORTALITY.* By Loraine Boettner. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1956. 159 pages. Cloth. \$2.50.

Three major concepts confront us under the above title: physical death, immortality, and the intermediate state. The first section involves the nature of death as well as the Christian's attitude toward it. Thereupon immortality is examined from the base of history, philosophy, and theology. Finally various viewpoints involving a second probation, soul sleep, annihilation, purgatory, and spiritualism are presented. Throughout the book the endeavor to permit God to speak is evident. In this we find the strength of the presentation. An obvious error has occurred on page 17, where the words of Jesus directed to Martha of Bethany are identified with those spoken by Him to the woman at the well of Samaria.

LORENZ WUNDERLICH

*DICTIONARY OF ANTHROPOLOGY.* By Charles Winick. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956. vii and 572 pages. Cloth. \$10.00.

Anthropology, "certainly the most sprawling and probably the most ambitious of the social sciences," draws its polyglot vocabulary from all the continents and from a considerable number of other disciplines; and when these sources fail to furnish the right word, anthropologists calmly invent one. Winick's declaration that in consequence "anthropological language is rich and often very sensitive but only very little standardized" is an understatement. To help individuals inside and outside this some-

what bewildering field to find their lexicographical bearings, Winick defines some ten thousand terms from "à froid" (a term borrowed from ceramics) to "zygion" ("on the zygomatic arch, the most lateral point") via "cassowary," "fable," "kazoo," "pan," and "split spirant." In addition he furnishes brief biographical sketches of persons who made contributions to this expanding field before 1900. The articles are usually long enough really to say something. In a random sampling of terms other than proper nouns and adjectives, 41 per cent were not contained in this reviewer's collegiate dictionary; this would indicate a comfortingly high degree of usefulness for the average nonspecialist.

ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN

*THE FORMS OF MUSIC.* By Donald Tovey. New York: Meridian Books, 1956. 251 pages. Paper. \$1.35.

The essays included in this manual are all drawn from the articles on music which Sir Donald Tovey (1875—1940) prepared for the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. They include discussions of the various forms of sacred music, e.g., the motet, mass, cantata, chorale, chorale prelude, oratorio, etc. The volume includes in all twenty-eight clear and relatively simple articles on different kinds and elements of music. WALTER E. BUSZIN

*BEGINNING FROM JERUSALEM.* By John Foster. New York: The Association Press, 1956. 92 pages. Cloth. \$1.25.

This well-written volume tells in a succinct manner the story of the mission work of the Christian Church to the year 1700. Sunday school teachers and laymen in general will benefit from this work.

CARL S. MEYER

*THEY WHO PREACH.* By John M. Ellison. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1956. 180 pages. Cloth. \$2.50.

This book sets out to help a minister reappraise his task, his message, his method, his relationships, and his ideas. It is written by a man who has been a preacher since 1912, a teacher from 1927. From 1934 to 1936 he served as a pastor in Washington, D. C., and simultaneously as a teacher at Harvard University. After this he became the first Negro president of Virginia Union Seminary. The nine chapters cover large homiletical areas—are more explicit in reminding "that" than in saying "how."

GEORGE W. HOYER

*N.F.S. GRUNDTVIG: AN AMERICAN STUDY.* By Earnest D. Nielsen. Rock Island: Augustana Press, 1955. xiii and 173 pages. Cloth. \$2.75.

Dr. Nielsen is president of the American Evangelical Lutheran Church's Grand View College, Des Moines, Iowa. Danish born, educated in Denmark and America, he served as pastor and professor before becoming

an administrator. His background, interests, and scholarship alike equip him to handle his topic with skill and authority.

Dr. Nielsen adopts as his frame of reference Grundtvig's absolute faith in spirit. He says: "It is the one concept that characterizes the man and his lifework. To grasp the reality of spirit in the degree in which Grundtvig did may not be possible for all. Nevertheless, the concept of spirit furnishes the frame of reference which gives intelligibility to Grundtvig's grasp of interplay of thoughts and action in the development of human history. For Grundtvig the determinant of history is spirit. His absolute faith in spirit saved him many times from forcing the tempo of faith. His speciality as an historian was to trace the course of the spirit as evidenced in the development of historical evolution. As a religious thinker, who was deeply steeped in history, he gave a dynamic conception to the living word as the Spirit's vehicle of revelation, and as a churchman he championed freedom on the ground of the primacy of spirit." (p. viii)

This frame of reference makes it difficult to determine at times whether Nielsen—or should one say Grundtvig?—means "Spirit" or "spirit." Yet there can be no question of the importance of Grundtvig nor of the need to arrive at an understanding of his philosophy and of his theology. To further such an understanding Dr. Nielsen's treatise may well be utilized. It is a study of real significance. Sad to say, it lacks an index.

CARL S. MEYER

*THE QUESTION BOX.* W. N. Emch. Columbus: The Wartburg Press, 1956. 188 pages. Cloth. \$2.50.

For a number of years the author has conducted a column of questions and answers on problems submitted by readers of the *Lutheran Standard*; he has done a good job. Many of these, about 170, have been gathered and classified and are offered to the reading public in this volume. They cover a multitude of topics and problems in the area of Christian faith and life. The answers which we have read are conservative and Biblical.

O. E. SOHN

*THE POLITICS OF ENGLISH DISSENT: The Religious Aspects of Liberal and Humanitarian Reform Movements from 1815 to 1848.* By Raymond G. Cowherd. New York: New York University Press, 1956. 242 pages. Cloth. \$5.00.

In the England of the first half of the nineteenth century there was need for social and political reform and for greater liberty for religious dissenters. Yet England did not experience the revolutions of 1830 and 1848, much less a revolution such as that in France in 1789. By 1848, however, England had removed many of the religious disabilities, some of the political disabilities, and had abolished colonial slavery. Steps had been taken to correct some of the evil results of the Industrial Revolution.

The Corn Laws were repealed. The beginnings of national education had been made. In these movements the evangelicals and the dissenters played important roles. The interrelationships between those movements and groups are examined in this volume by a Lehigh University historian.

The exposition is a careful one, amply documented (the notes at the close of the book cover 47 pages). The bibliography occupies another 16 pages. The book adds to an understanding of this period in English history and serves to bring into sharper focus the impact on the social and political life exerted by certain religious groups.

CARL S. MEYER

*LEARNING TOGETHER IN THE CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP.* By Sara Little. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1956. 104 pages. Paper. \$1.50.

Much has been written on group study and group dynamics, but little of it has been applied to the Christian fellowship. "Group dynamics" becomes more than an elusive phase in this practical volume on methods of group study.

Those forces within a group which vitally influence a person's growth and behavior are given concise treatment. The meaning of the group climate, the part a person plays in the group, and the constant interaction among group members are given careful description and evaluation, although we believe the author should have been more careful in defining the "redeeming" community.

Leaders of study groups in the church will find this book of value in understanding and employing group methods. Fifteen ways to conduct group study, with emphasis on Bible study, are discussed.

HARRY G. COINER

*PSYCHOLOGY AND WORSHIP.* By R. S. Lee. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956. 110 pages. Cloth. \$3.75.

This is an Anglican cleric's application of modified Freudian psychology to the act of worship. One of his first basic considerations is valid: there can be a psychology of worship. Only if we conclude that the supernatural somehow operates only on spirit, can we deny investigation by psychology in this act of man.

On the other hand, it is a most difficult feat to be psychological and theological at the same time and to keep both disciplines in their places. The author succeeds in being Freudian, but is confused in his Christianity. While worship somehow may be related to man's instincts or primitive urges, in the sense that even natural man knows that there is a God, man does not know Christ by shaping up an ego ideal.

Still our sense of worship can be sharpened by insights into the psychological processes. If the reader asks himself in what sense the depth observations advanced in this book are true, he will be well stimulated.

K. H. BREIMEIER

*THE STORY OF STEWARDSHIP IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.* By George A. E. Salstrand. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1956. 153 pages. Cloth. \$3.50.

Beginning with the story of ministerial support in young America, Dr. Salstrand traces the rise and progress of stewardship in the various evangelical denominations of the country. He describes the men and the ideas (such as the Lord's acre) that figure in this story. A good bibliography adds to the value of the book. ALFRED O. FUERBRINGER

*PERSUASIVE PREACHING.* By Ronald E. Sleeth. New York: Harper & Brothers, c. 1956. 96 pages. Cloth. \$1.75.

This small book stresses factors of psychology in preaching but is silent on the persuasiveness of the message of the redemption of Jesus Christ. RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

*DOCTRINAL PREACHING FOR TODAY: Case Studies of Bible Teachings.* By Andrew W. Blackwood. New York: Abingdon Press, c. 1956. 224 pages. Cloth. \$3.00.

This book furnishes numerous common-sense suggestions about doctrinal preaching and many quotations. The unity of Christian doctrine about the core of the atonement through Christ is not stressed. The power of the Gospel is duly accented with regard to evangelistic preaching, but not with reference to the preaching of ethics. Interesting "doctrinal series" are suggested. The section on "Preparing the Doctrinal Sermon" includes numerous elements beyond the subject. RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

*FREEDOM'S HOLY LIGHT.* By Merrimon Cuninggim. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, c. 1955. 192 pages. Cloth. \$2.75.

In contrast to much "wall of partition" theorizing on church and state, this book explores the mutual contributions that government and religion need to make and sets up a road of co-operation which is not mixture. Ample references buttress the notes. It remains to see these splendid and important principles applied in current working situations. RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

#### BOOKS RECEIVED

(The mention of a book in this list acknowledges its receipt and does not preclude a further discussion of its contents in the Book Review section.)

*Moro Sheeba.* By Beatrice Tannehill King. Chicago: Moody Press, 1957. 128 pages. Cloth. \$2.25.

*The Evangelical Doctrine of Law.* By E. F. Kevan. London: The Tyndale Press, 1956. 28 pages. Paper. 1/6.

*The Central Philosophy of Buddhism.* By T. R. V. Murti. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955. xiii + 372 pages. Cloth. \$6.75.

*Ceci est mon corps: Explication de ces paroles de Jésus-Christ.* By F. J. Leenhardt. Paris: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1955. 73 pages. Paper. Swiss francs 3.85.

*His Heart in Our Work: Thoughts for a Priestly Apostolate*, ed. Francis L. Filas. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1954. x + 192 pages. Cloth. \$3.75.

*Islam and Christian Theology.* By J. Windrow Sweetman. Part II, Vol. I. London: Lutterworth Press, 1955. x + 354 pages. Cloth. 31/6.

*The Two-Edged Sword: An Interpretation of the Old Testament.* By John L. McKenzie. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1956. xv + 317 pages. Cloth. \$4.50.

*Hymnal for Colleges and Schools*, ed. E. Harold Geer. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1956. xlvii + 352 + 95 pages. Cloth. \$4.75.

*The Hymnody of the Christian Church.* By Louis F. Benson. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1956. 310 pages. Cloth. \$4.50.

*The Life of Robert Southwell, Poet and Martyr.* By Christopher Devlin. New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, 1956. x + 367 pages. Cloth. \$5.00.

*Religion, Morality, and Law*, ed. Arthur L. Harding. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1956. xi + 109 pages. Cloth. \$3.00.

*Three Dimensions of Public Morality.* By Herbert W. Schneider. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1956. 166 pages. Cloth. \$3.00.

*Dutch Immigrant Memoirs and Related Writings.* By Henry S. Lucas. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1955. Vol. I, 514 pages. Vol. II, 479 pages. Cloth. \$15.00.

*Little Visits with God.* By Allan Hart Jahsmann and Martin Simon. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1957. xi + 287 pages. Cloth. \$3.00.

*Luther und die Schwärmer.* By Karl Gerhard Steck. Zollikon: Evangelischer Verlag, 1955. 64 pages. Paper. 4.15 Swiss francs.

*Shechem: A Traditio-Historical Investigation.* By Eduard Nielsen. Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad, 1955. 384 pages. Paper. 30 Danish crowns.

*Travaux Liturgiques: De Doctrine et d'Histoire.* By Bernard Capelle. Vol. I: *Doctrine*. Louvain: Abbaye du Mont César, 1955. 282 pages. Paper. No price.

*Royal Commission on Marriage and Divorce: Report, 1951—55.* London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1956. ix + 405 pages. Paper. 11/6.

*Byzantium: Greatness and Decline (Byzance, grandeur et décadence).* By Charles Diehl, trans. Naomi Walford. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1957. xviii + 366 pages. Cloth. \$8.50.

*The Gospel and the Catholic Church.* By Arthur Michael Ramsey. 2d ed. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1956. xiv + 234 pages. Cloth. \$3.50.

*Jewish Religious Polemic.* By Oliver Shaw Rankin. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1956. viii + 256 pages. Cloth. \$4.50.



IEW

By  
aper.

ancis  
192

II,  
1/6.

By  
956.

ven:

ich-

lin.  
oth.

ern

der.  
.00.

cas.  
. II,

on.  
oth.

an-

en.  
ns.

lle.  
ges.

on-  
/6.

e).  
ni-

ey.  
34

k: